THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FORTY-SIX FIRST QUARTER, 1952

John Martyn, "Printer to the Royal Society"

By LEONA ROSTENBERG*

ON May 5, 1649, a young London firm registered its first publication at Stationers' Hall. Perhaps because the senior partner had experienced some difficulty in marketing his recently composed *Sermon of Walking Humbly With God,* John Ridley, a sergeant chaplain of Sergeant's Inn, London, opened a shop for the sale and publication of his own and other books at The Castle in Fleet Street near Ram's Alley.[1] Although Ridley apparently enjoyed some prominence as a chaplain, his partner, John Martyn, was not entirely unknown to the London booktrade since he had served his apprenticeship in the stationers' ranks.

* I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the officers of the Royal Society, London, who placed at my disposal the Oldenburg Manuscripts; to Mr. S. Hodgson for his assistance in the examination of the various manuscript records at Stationers' Hall, London, and to Mr. R. T. Rivington, Clerk of Stationers' Company, who granted permission to examine this material.

[1] For Ridley, see Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London, 1907), 155; for *Sermon,* see *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers. From 1640-1708 A.D.* (London, 1913), I, 317. (Cited in following references as *Transcript.*)

In the annals of this Company was now actively enrolled a name, which, during the following thirty-one years, was to represent the manifold, enviable and exciting activities of the profession. Described by John Dunton as one "who managed all his affairs with discretion . . . a thriving man in his trade," Martyn was to embrace the rôles of bookseller of current publications in parlor literature, science and pseudo-science, theology and history; first "printer" and bookseller to the greatest of scientific academies, the Royal Society; publisher of seventeenth-century scientific thunderbolts; importer of old and new foreign books; friend of the learned and genial proprietor of The Bell, the haunt of Restoration *virtuosi*.[2]

John Martyn was born about 1619, the son of John Martyn of London, a merchant tailor. On February 4, 1634, he began his apprenticeship with one of the prominent metropolitan booksellers, Humphrey Robinson, established at The Three Pigeons, St. Paul's Churchyard. Martyn worked for eight years as an apprentice under Robinson, from whom he received excellent training in bookselling and some experience in publishing. At the conclusion of his apprenticeship in 1642, he was declared a freeman of the Stationers' Company, having been sponsored by his former employer.[3]

Martyn's activities from 1642 to 1649 are obscure and it is not until his partnership with Ridley that he reëmerges fully as a participant of the London booktrade.

Together with Ridley, Martyn issued during their partnership of two years an approximate eight books, largely of theological content, with the lively exception of Withers' *Description of the Grand Seignors Seraglio* and the *Game of Picquett* translated

[2] John Dunton, *The Life and Errors* (London, 1818), 212.

[3] The date of Martyn's birth is based upon his date of apprenticeship, 1634, which he entered approximately at the age of fifteen. See *Apprentices Register Books, July 29, 1605-27 June 1666* (MS, Stationers' Hall). For Robinson, see Plomer, *op. cit.*, 155. For Martyn's Declaration of Freemanship, see *The Register of Freemen* (March 1, 1642) (MS, Stationers' Hall).

from the French.[4] By April 1651, Martyn's partnership with Ridley had been dissolved and he had set up shop alone at The Bell in St. Paul's Churchyard. Here he issued within the course of a year at least four books, while his former partner during the same period probably published two.[5] Before the end of the year 1652 The Bell witnessed two changes. Martyn employed in 1652 his first apprentice, Richard Eavornor, and formed a new partnership.[6] The various books now emerging from The Bell from 1652 to 1670 were frequently to bear the felicitous imprint of John Martyn and James Allestry.[7]

Henry Oldenburg, the future Secretary of the Royal Society, cared little for Allestry, whom he described as an "habituee of snuff." Despite this addiction, Allestry's partnership with Martyn prospered. In 1657 the partners were joined by Thomas Dicas, who died February 8, 1668, "at midnight of consumption, much indebted." Allestry appears to have remained with Martyn at The Bell until about 1665, when he opened his own

[4] Together Martyn & Ridley published: John Ridley, *Sermon* (1649), William Laud, *Officium Quotidianum* (1650), Thomas Hobbes, *De Corpore Politico* (1649), Leo Modena, *The History of the Rights and Customs of the present Jews* (1650), Withers, *A Description of the Grand Seignors Seraglio* (1650), Rabbi Nathan, *Capitum a patrum* (1650), *The Game of Picquett* (1650), Renatus Descartes, *The Passions of the Soul* (1650). The total number of books printed by Martyn and his various partners, Ridley, Allestry and Dicas, and later by himself alone, is an approximate estimate based upon such bibliographies as: Donald G. Wing, *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland . . . 1641-1700* (New York, 1945-48) Vols. I & II; Edward Arber, *The Term Catalogues 1668-1709* (London, 1903) and *Transcript.* It is impossible to list a definite total of books published by Martyn as undoubtedly titles have been lost in the passage of time and some have eluded the bibliographers.

[5] Martyn published: *A Treatise concerning the right use of the Fathers in the Decisions of Controversies that are at this day in Religion* (1651), Edward Terry, *A Relation of a Voyage to the Easterne India* (1651), Thomas Hobbes, *De Corpore Politico* (1652), Nathaniel Highmore, *The History of Generation* (1652); Ridley published: John Cowell, *The Institutes of the Civill and Imperiall Laws of England* (1651), and Thomas Hobbes, *De Corpore Politico* (1652).

[6] Eavornor was with Martyn, 24 June 1652 to 25 June 1660. See *Calendar of Masters & Apprentices 1649-96* (MS, Stationers' Hall).

[7] For Allestry, see Plomer, *op. cit.*, 3; *The Register of Freemen* (1 July 1647): "James Allestree was sworn and admitted a freeman of this company (sponsored by Mr. Thomason)." The first joint publication of Martyn and Allestry was Lorenzo Gracian, *The Spanish Heroe* (1652).

shop, The Rose and Crown. They continued, however, to publish together until Allestry's death in 1670.[8]

The success of Martyn and Allestry had permitted them to engage in 1656 a second apprentice. Along with the aforementioned Eavornor they now had in their employ Thomas Thornicraft, who later set up as a bookseller at The Sun in St. Paul's Churchyard. In 1664 Thomas Hughes was employed at The Bell, but he does not appear to have followed the trade after the termination of his apprenticeship.[9]

The affluence of The Bell may be ascribed to its publications and the sale of rare and modern books. During their association of eighteen years Martyn and Allestry together, or in partnership with Dicas, published an approximate total of 102 books, many of which were of unique importance in the progress of science and intellectual development. The largest proportions of their output represent the fields of science, belles-lettres and theology. Among the best-sellers in literature were the plays of Madame Scudéry, Butler's *Hudibras,* Cowley's *Poems* and, for the bluestocking, the various compositions of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle.[10]

Martyn's reputation, however, rests upon his publication and sale of scientific books, many of which introduced startling and new ideas to the devotees of the New Science. During this period the firm issued Graunt's *Natural and Political Observations*

[8] For Dicas, see Plomer, *op. cit.,* 64; *The Register of Freemen* (6 November 1655): "Thomas Dicus admitted a freeman of this company (Sponsored by Mr. Oct. Pulleyn)." For Dicas' death see Henry Ellis, ed., *The Obituary of Richard Smyth* (London, 1849), 80; for Allestry's death: *ibid.,* 89.

[9] Thornicraft was with Martyn, 1 August 1656 to 2 August 1663. See *Calendar of Masters & Apprentices 1649–96;* Henry Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668-1725* (London, 1922), 288. Hughes was with Martyn 6 May 1672 to 7 May 1679; see *Calendar of Masters,* etc.

[10] Madeleine de Scudéry, *Almahide, ou l'Esclave Reine* (1660), Samuel Butler, *Hudibras* (1664), Abraham Cowley, *Poemata Latina* (1668), Margaret Newcastle, *Natures Pictures* (1656), *The Philosophical Opinions* (1655), *Philosophical Fancies* (1653), *Playes* (1662), *Poems and Fancies* (1653), *The Worlds Olio* (1655).

upon the Bills of Mortality, Hooke's *Micrographia,* the various works of the Bolognese physiologist, Marcello Malpighi, the medical investigations of Thomas Willis, the new progressive ideas for the rehabilitation of the deaf suggested in the *Elements of Speech* by William Holder, and other works of stature.[11] Besides the firm's output of an approximate 33 scientific books, may be added their greatest scientific achievement, the publication of the *Philosophical Transactions,* the official monthly organ of the recently established Royal Society, whose Council had officially appointed at a special meeting of October 26, 1663, John Martyn and James Allestry as "Printers to the Royal Society."[12]

According to the original charter granted to the Royal Society in August 1662, the members were permitted "to elect, nominate and appoint one or more booksellers or printers who were to publish such matters and concerns pertinent to the Society."[13] At a meeting of October 26, 1663, Bishop John Wilkins and Dr. Jonathan Goddard were appointed to draw up a statute for the duty of the printers of the Society. On the same day the President, Lord Brouncker, reported that:

> Because the Stationers and Printers are one and the same Company and they . . . practice both trades promiscuously the Society might choose a stationer for their printer without any violation to their charter . . . whereupon Mr. John Martyn and Mr. James Allestry being recommended to the Society, it was put to the question whether the office of the printer to the Royal Society should be conferred on the said Mr. Martyn and Mr. Allestry jointly; and it was carried in the affirmative: after which, those two persons were put to the ballot, and chosen.[14]

[11] The firm issued 3 editions of Graunt's work, 1662, 1665 (2); 2 editions of the *Micrographia,* 1665 and 1667; Marcello Malpighi, *Dissertatio Epistolica de Bombyce* (1669), *De viscerum structura Exercitatio* (1669), Thomas Willis, *Diatribae duae Medico-Philosophicae* (1659), *Cerebri Anatome* (1664); William Holder, *Elements of Speech* (1669).

[12] For appointment of Martyn and Allestry as "Printers to the Royal Society," see Thomas Birch, *The History of the Royal Society of London* (London, 1756), I, 321.

[13] Birch, *op. cit.,* I, 95.

[14] *Ibid.,* I, 321.

The recommendation of Martyn and Allestry may be ascribed to two possible factors. By 1663 the firm had prospered and its growing interest in the publication of scientific works had undoubtedly attracted the attention of many members of the Society. Together they had published works by Willis and Graunt and had in manuscript for issue in 1664 Evelyn's *Sylva.*[15] It is quite probable that these early and important Society fellows promoted the candidacy of their publishers, who already enjoyed the patronage of Robert Hooke, one of the prime movers of the group. Although Martyn and Allestry had as yet not published Hooke's *Micrographia,* the young scientist was a constant visitor to The Bell. He appears to have regarded the shop as having been established largely for his own bibliophilic eccentricities. Here he browsed almost daily; purchased considerable material "on approval"; returned almost an equal proportion; made outright purchases and settled his bill several weeks later, occasionally altering the total to his own advantage. Martyn appears to have indulged his pet customer's not uncommon or unfamiliar bibliophilic idiosyncrasies and in return the coddled scientist perhaps suggested the name of his long-suffering bookseller as "Printer to the Society."[16]

By November 2, 1663, the printers' commission had been completed:

> We give and grant unto the said John Martyn and James Allestry full power and privilidge to print all such things, matters and businesses concerning the Royal Society as shall be committed unto them by the President and Council of the said Society or any seven more of them. And we do further give and grant unto the said John Martyn and James Allestry that no other person (except any duly chosen and sworn as aforesaid) shall print any of the said things, matters and businesses concerning the Royal Society.[17]

[15] See note 11; John Evelyn, *Sylva* (1664).

[16] For Hooke's intimacy with Martyn, see Henry W. Robinson and Walter Adams, eds., *The Diary of Robert Hooke* (London, 1935), *passim.*

[17] Birch, *op. cit.*, I, 323.

At a meeting of the following week Martyn and Allestry presented themselves before the Society, where the statutes of their duties were read to them. They were afforded the opportunity of considering their honored appointment and "upon consideration having no exception to anything contained in the said commission and statutes were sworn printers to the Society."[18]

In their official capacity, Martyn and Allestry were "to print and vend such books besides catalogues and such other things as committed to them by order of the Society or Council." The "printers" were to abide by suggestions from the Council as to the "correctness of the edition, the number of copies printed, the form or volume, the goodness of the paper, character, figures and diagrams, the price at which books are to be sold." They were allowed to issue no reprint or translation or digest without the Council's permission. They were compelled to present:

> Of every book printed two copies extraordinary well bound to his Majesty and one copy to Edward Earl of Clarendon, Lord Chancellor, one copy to the President of the Royal Society, two copies to the library of the said Society, each of them fairly bound, and one copy more to each of the Secretaries of the said Society.[19]

Any disregard of these orders would call for immediate satisfaction or dismissal.

Designated as "printers to the Royal Society," Martyn and Allestry, together or alone, published sixteen known books by members relating to the exact and natural sciences. These included works by Evelyn, Wilkins, Malpighi, Willughby, Lister and others.[20] Before any manuscript could be released for pub-

[18] *Ibid.*, I, 328.

[19] *The Record of the Royal Society of London* (London, 1940), 298 f.

[20] Books authorized by the Royal Society, bearing the Imprimatur, printed by Martyn alone or with Allestry: (1) John Evelyn, *Sylva* (1664), (2) Robert Hooke, *Micrographia* (1665), (3) John Graunt, *Naturall and Politicall Observations made upon the Bills of Mortality* (1665), (4) Walter Charleton, *Inquisitiones II. Anatomico-Physicae* (1665), (5) Thomas Sprat, *History of the Royal Society of London* (1667), (6) John Wilkins, *An Essay towards a Real Character* (1668), (7)

lication and include the Society's Imprimatur, it was examined by two Fellows who were to report "that such a book contains nothing but what is suitable to the design and work of the Society."[21]

The approved manuscript was then forwarded by Martyn and Allestry to any one of several large London printing firms. Although Martyn and Allestry were designated as "printers to the Royal Society," they were actually publishers and consigned the press work to various craftsmen. Thomas Roycroft, printer of the celebrated Polyglot Bible, ran a large establishment at Charterhouse Yard, while John Macock, printer at Addling Hill, engaged ten workmen. Other establishments favored by Martyn and Allestry were those of William Godbid of Anchor Inn and Thomas Newcomb, owner of the King's Printing House in the Savoy, where he employed seven compositors and five pressmen.[22]

An edition consisted probably of a maximum of one thousand copies. In the preface to the second edition of his *Sylva*, Evelyn stated that more than a thousand copies of the work had been purchased in less than two years—with reference to the first edition of 1664—"which Book-Sellers assure us is a very extraordinary thing in volumes of this bulk."[23] Graunt's *Natural and Political Observations* ran through three editions after its official sponsorship by the Society in 1665, although Martyn and Allestry had published an earlier edition. Willughby's lavishly illustrated *Ornithologia* was presented to the public three times, while

Marcello Malpighi, *Dissertatio Epistolica de Bombyce* (1669), (8) William Holder, *Elements of Speech* (1669), (9) Jerome Lobo, *A Short Relation of the River Nile* (1669), (10) John Evelyn, *Sylva* (1670), (11) Jeremiah Horrocks, *Opera Posthvma* (1673), (12) John Wallis, *A Discourse of Gravity* (1675), (13) Marcello Malpighi, *Anatome Plantarum* (1675-79), (14) Francis Willughby, *Ornithologiae libri tres* (1676), (15) John Evelyn, *Philosophical Discourse of Earth* (1676), (16) Martin Lister, *Historiae Animalium Angliae Tres Tractatus* (1678).

[21] Birch, *op. cit.*, I, 346.

[22] Plomer, *op. cit.* (1641-67), 158, 121, 83, 136.

[23] John Evelyn, *Sylva* (1670), Dedication of Evelyn to Charles II of England.

A Short Relation of the River Nile by the Jesuit, Lobo, and Hooke's *Micrographia* enjoyed two editions each.[24]

The popularity of these books may be attributed to their inherent value, the personal interest shown in them by fellow members, and The Bell's advertising program. As publishers of the *Philosophical Transactions,* Martyn and Allestry, in association with the Society, could use its monthly issues as an advertising medium. In addition, Martyn announced the Society's books in his large *Catalogue* of 1670 and in several of his own publications. He also realized the value of the important local newssheet, *The London Gazette,* where he advertised, in the issue of October 22-25, 1677, Willughby's *Ornithologia* as "illustrated by the most Elegant Figures neatly resembling the Live Birds." Later his announcement of Lister's *History of English Animals* appeared in the same paper.[25]

Although these publications were sold at The Bell, it appears that the Society itself considered its own sale of the books. In March 1663, Sir John Hoskyns suggested that the "Society might vend to advantage the books printed."[26] It is not known whether this motion was adopted, but it is apparent that, in addition to the eight compulsory gift copies, Martyn was often compelled to part gratuitously with "release" and authors' copies. The Council granted the request of Bishop Wilkins to take from Martyn a half dozen copies of Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* "to be presented to some persons from whom he expected contributions." It appears that Martyn did not completely relish these periodic incursions into his stock, since, in 1672, the Society

[24] Graunt (1662), (1665, 2 editions), 1676; Willughby (1675, 1676, 1677); Lobo (1669, 1673); Hooke (1665, 1667).

[25] Martyn advertised the following in the *Philosophical Transactions:* Holder, *Elements of Speech,* no. 47 (May 10, 1669); Evelyn, *Sylva,* no. 54 (November 15, 1669); Lister, *Historiae Animalium Angliae Tres Tractatus,* no. 139 (April-June, 1678). Martyn advertised in his 1670 *Catalogue* books by Wilkins, Lobo, Holder, Malpighi, Evelyn, Hooke, Sprat; see also *The London Gazette,* no. 1245 (October 22-25, 1677), no. 1299 (April 29-May 2, 1678).

[26] Birch, *op. cit.,* I, 329.

ordered that "What copies of Signor Malpighi's De Formatione Pulli in Ovo, the printer would not furnish for the author gratis should be paid for by the Society who has lately ordered 30 copies of it to be sent to him in Bologna."[27]

After Martyn had suggested a third edition of Evelyn's *Sylva*, the author regarded him as avaricious, stating that Martyn had made five hundred pounds from the previous editions.[28] It is quite possible that Martyn reaped a goodly harvest from the Royal Society publications. The prices ranged from one shilling to one pound, ten, depending upon whether the works were unbound, stitched or bound. The most expensive volumes were Willughby's *Ornithologia*, fetching one pound, ten shillings, and Malpighi's *Anatome Plantarum Observationes*, bringing one pound. The relative high price of these two books was undoubtedly based upon the high cost of production, since both publications were lavishly illustrated, Malpighi's work having taken four years for the completion of both volumes.[29]

In addition to the publication of books by fellow members, Martyn printed sundry matters for the Society: membership lists and tickets, and his invoice for such odd jobs in July 1679 amounted to six pounds, sixteen shillings.[30]

[27] *Ibid.*, II, 249; III, 60.

[28] William Bray, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn* (London, n.d.), II, 106.

[29] The following authorized works of fellows of the Royal Society were priced as follows:

(1) Graunt, *Naturall and Politicall Observations upon the Bills of Mortality* (1676). Bound 2*s.* 6*d.*
(2) Holder, *Elements of Speech* (1669). Bound 2*s.*
(3) Lobo, *Short Relation of the River Nile* (1669). Bound 1*s.*
(4) Evelyn, *Sylva* (1670). Bound 10*s.*
(5) Horrocks, *Opera Posthvma* (1673). Bound 9*s.*
(6) Wallis, *A Discourse of Gravity* (1675). Sticht 6*d.*
(7) Malpighi, *Anatome Plantarum Observationes* (1675-9). Bound 20*s.*
(8) Willughby, *Ornithologia* (1676). Bound £1 10*s.*
(9) Evelyn, *Philosophical Discourse of the Earth* (1676). Bound 1*s.* 6*d.*
(10) Lister, *Historiae Animalium Angliae Tres Tractatus* (1678). Bound 7*s.*

See Arber, I, 260, 10, 9, 23, 128, 205, 229, 220, 320.

[30] Birch, *op. cit.*, III, 501.

As "Printers to the Royal Society," Martyn and Allestry assumed their most responsible and exacting task in the publication of the *Philosophical Transactions*, an undertaking, which, during its early years, was threatened by pestilence, fire and personal animosity. It was ordered at a Society meeting of March 1664 that: "The Philosophical Transactions to be composed by Mr. Oldenburg be printed the first Monday of every month, if he have sufficient matter for it." The "copy" was to be reviewed by delegated members, to be printed in four sheets in folio, and to be published by John Martyn and James Allestry.[31]

Henry Oldenburg, German by birth and irascible by nature, was appointed first Secretary of the Society and first editor of the *Transactions*. Oldenburg was described by a contemporary as "a man of peculiar temper, which prevented him from agreeing well with others." Of a suspicious and choleric disposition, Oldenburg was frequently at odds with his publishers. He disapproved of Allestry's "snuff-pinching" and regarded Martyn as "morose and fickle" and his behavior "mightily tedious." Despite these respective personality failings, a certain degree of cooperation existed between Oldenburg and his publishers which resulted in the publication of the most important and enduring scientific periodical, the *Philosophical Transactions*.[32]

In 1653, Oldenburg had come to reside permanently in London, where he eventually took up residence in "the middle of ye Pall-Mall in St. James's fields." A friend of the English scientists, he was elected a member of the first Council of the Royal Society in 1663 and was appointed first Secretary along with Bishop John Wilkins.

As editor of the *Transactions*, Oldenburg assumed the financial responsibility of the publication. He regarded himself as a "well-wisher to the advancement of usefull knowledge" and under-

[31] *Ibid.*, II, 18.

[32] Oldenburg to Boyle, September 12, 1667, in Robert Boyle, *Works* (London, 1744), V, 365.

took the publication of the *Transactions* upon his "private account."[33]

The first issue of the *Philosophical Transactions*, Number One, Year One, March 6, 1664/65, was printed by Thomas Newcomb for John Martyn and James Allestry. The issue included Oldenburg's dedication to the Royal Society and a modest bow to the republic of science:

> Whereas there is nothing more necessary for promoting the improvement of Philosophical Matters, than the communicating to such, as apply their Studies and Endeavours that way . . . it is therefore thought fit to employ the Press, as the most proper way to gratifie those, whose engagement in such studies . . . doth entitle them to the knowledge of what this kingdom, or other parts of the world do, from time to time, afford.

The first and succeeding numbers of the *Transactions* appeared in quarto and not in folio and averaged about 16 pages, including an approximate five featured articles, news items from foreign correspondents and a book review section. A single issue varied from six pence to a shilling; a bound volume for the year ranged from seven shillings to eight and six.[34]

The issues appeared regularly the first Monday of every month from March to July 3, 1665, number 5, when the reader was advised:

> That by reason of the present Contagion in London, which may unhappily cause an interruption as wel [*sic*] of Correspondencies, as of Publick Meetings, the printing of these Philosophical Transactions may possibly for awhile be intermitted though endeavours shall be used to continue them, if it may be.[35]

[33] Charles R. Weld, *A History of the Royal Society* (London, 1848), I, 181.

[34] Prices for single issues and bound annual sets of the *Transactions* varied: single issues: 1669: 6*d*., 1672: 12*d*., 1673: 6*d*., 1673: 1*s*., 1674: 6*d*., 1677: 18*d*. Complete annual runs: 1669 bound: 7*s*. 6*d*., 1672: 8*s*. 6*d*., 1673: 7*s*. 6*d*., 1674: 7*s*. 6*d*., 1675: 7*s*. 6*d*., 1676: 8*s*., 1688: 8*s*. *The General Index to all the Philosophical Transactions* (1678) 1*s*. See Arber, *Term Catalogue*, I, 14; Hooke, *Diary*, 12, 67, 146, 322; Arber, I, 31, 98, 136, 172, 238, 274.

[35] Birch, *op. cit.*, II, 57; *Philosophical Transactions*, I:5 (July 3, 1665).

Because of the rapid spread of the Plague throughout London, the meetings of the Society had been discontinued on June 20, 1665, and the publication of the *Transactions* was not resumed until November 6, 1665, with the appearance of the sixth number. This issue was not published by Martyn and Allestry but by Richard Davis, the Oxford bookseller, located near Oriel College. Oldenburg included a brief notice for his disappointed subscribers:

> An opportunity being presented to revive the publishing of these papers, which for some moneths [*sic*] hath been discontinued by reason of the great mortality in London, where they were begun to be printed, it hath been thought fit to embrace the same.[36]

Davis was also responsible for the publication of the seventh number of the *Transactions*, which appeared in December. During its preparation Oldenburg appears to have indulged his "peculiar temper." He accused the Oxford stationer of collusion with Allestry in not trying to distribute remaining copies of the *Transactions* and attempting to reduce the price. The irate Oldenburg asserted that there existed among the bookdealers "a kind of conjuration and a very mystical one." His hopes for the distribution of the *Transactions* during the duration of the Plague were small. In an anxious letter addressed to Boyle, he discussed Davis' pessimism regarding the vendibility of the periodical:

> Of ye first transactions he [Davis] had printed he had not vended above 300; and . . . he fears there will be hardly so many as to repay ye charge of paper and printing . . . yet he concludes yt notwithstanding these discouragments if you and I, doe think fit to have any more printed at Oxford he will readily serve us in ye managing thereof.

Oldenburg remarked that Davis had proposed an increased sale of the *Transactions* if they were sent to "three or four active stationers in severall quarters of (London) . . . Cambridge, Exeter,

[36] *Philosophical Transactions*, 1:6 (Oxford, Lichfield for Davis, November 6, 1665). For Davis, see Plomer, *op. cit.*, 1641-67, 62.

Brystoll and Ireland and Scotland." It was Oldenburg's opinion that Davis should distribute copies among the booksellers at The Exchange, "for there (I find they are inquired after) and about Dunstans in Fleet Street and to another about Westminster."[37] It appears that the *Transactions* enjoyed some sale, as Davis kept his promise and published Number Eight, January 1665/66.[38]

Despite Oldenburg's despair that "the plague was still afoot and discouraging all sorts of people from settling to business," Martyn and Allestry had "settled to business," since Number Nine of the *Transactions*, February 1665/66, appeared with the familiar imprint.[39] It is quite possible that the Society "printers" had left London during the height of the Plague. Eighty craftsmen had succumbed to its ravages and undoubtedly Martyn and Allestry, as Oldenburg had intimated, had "retired into the country with other London printers and stationers." Despite "troublesome times and high price of paper," Martyn and Allestry continued as publishers of the *Transactions* through September 1666.[40]

Although, together, Martyn and Allestry had withstood the threat of the Plague, they could no longer, as partners, surmount the holocaust of the Fire which swept the booksellers' quarters, leaving in its wake desolated stalls, blackened stumps of their former proud Hall, and water-soaked, charred fragments of books. By September 4, 1666, the Fire had reached St. Paul's Churchyard. Having feared this possibility, the stationers had identified their respective stocks and brought them for safekeeping to the ancient parish church of St. Faith under St. Paul's.

[37] Oldenburg to Boyle: December 19, 1665, in Boyle, *Works*, V, 343; original of this letter in *Oldenburg Manuscripts*, no. 43, Royal Society, London.

[38] *Philosophical Transactions*, I:8 (Oxford, W. Hall for R. Davis, January 8, 1665/66).

[39] Oldenburg to Boyle, January 16, 1665/66, in Boyle, *Works*, V, 347; *Philosophical Transactions*, I:9 (London, Martyn & Allestry, February 12, 1665/66).

[40] Birch, *op. cit.*, II, 61; Oldenburg to Boyle, March 6, 1665/66 *(Oldenburg Manuscripts)*, no. 48; Henry Plomer, *A Short History of English Printing* (London, 1916), 174.

Actually, St. Faith was a four-aisled crypt beneath the choir, ceiled with stout arches.[41] It was here that the Company had usually attended a service on Ash Wednesday and afterwards had retired to the Hall for "cakes, wine and ale." Evelyn declared that the ancient crypt had been filled with "magazines of books." With the collapse of its ceiling and the spread of the fire to the interior, the stocks were consumed, while the flames raged for an entire week. Within one day books valued at 150,000 pounds had been destroyed. Pepys noted in his *Diary* that "all the great book-dealers are almost undone, not only these, but their warehouses at the Hall and under Christ Church and elsewhere being all burned."[42]

It was from one of his most reliable stationers that Pepys had received an eye-witness account of the fury of the flames. Present when the fire reached St. Paul's, Martyn related that the flames had first hit a board which among others had been laid upon the roof instead of lead. "They first took fire from the Draper's side, by some timber of the houses that were burned falling into the Church." According to Martyn, one warehouse of books had been saved despite negative reports. It was his opinion that most of the booksellers planned to rebuild the following year, but at the present were most aggrieved at the conduct of Humphrey Henchman, Bishop of London, who used the stationers "most basely worse than any other landlord, saying he will be paid to this day the rent or he would not come to treat with them for the time to come and would not promise them anything how he would use them."[43]

The destruction of the booksellers' quarters had caused Oldenburg much alarm and he feared the fate of his future *Transac-*

[41] For the ravages of the fire, see Walter G. Bell, *The Great Fire of London in 1666* (London, 1920), 139, 226.

[42] S. Hodgson, "Papers and Documents Recently Found at Stationers' Hall," in: *The Library* (June-September, 1944), 32; Bray, *op. cit.*, II, 14; Henry B. Wheatley, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* (New York, n.d.), II, 301.

[43] Wheatley, *op. cit.*, II, 310.

tions. Writing to Boyle, he related the havoc created by the disaster:

> I shall find it very difficult to continue the printing of the Transactions. Martyn and Allestry being undone with the rest of the Stationers at St. Paul's Churchyard, and all their books burnt they had carried away for safety into St. Faith's Church . . . besides the City lying desolate now, it will be very hard to vend them at present.[44]

It would have been impossible for Martyn to have "vended" too many copies of the unsold *Transactions*. Despite Oldenburg's forlorn statement that all remainders had been destroyed, some copies had been saved, since Martyn advertised "A Compleat Collection of the Philosophical Transactions, for the year 1665, 1666," and succeeding years in his 1670 *Catalogue*.[45] Although Martyn sustained heavy losses in the Fire, unlike many of the local dealers he wasted little time in the reëstablishment of his business. In October 1666 he was able to publish Number Eighteen of the *Transactions* from his new premises at Temple Bar, where he had reopened The Bell.[46]

The *Transactions*, until their suspension in 1678, were published fairly regularly by Martyn alone or with the occasional coöperation of Allestry or another London bookseller. During these years the relationship between Martyn and Oldenburg scarcely improved. The Secretary characterized his publisher as hard and calculating, complaining that "Mr. Martyn deals very mercenarily with me knowing that others will hardly undertake the printing of these papers . . . he hath constrained me to abate him the rate yet lower so that after the proportion he allows me, I shall hardly bring it to 30 pounds a year."[47]

The final fracas between Martyn and Oldenburg occurred in

[44] Oldenburg to Boyle, September 10, 1666, in Boyle, *Works*, V, 358.

[45] John Martyn, *A Cataloge* [*sic*] *Of Some Books Printed for, and sold by John Martyn, at the Bell a Little without Temple-Bar* (1670), 1.

[46] *Philosophical Transactions*, I:18 (October 22, 1666).

[47] Oldenburg to Boyle, September 24, 1667, in Boyle, *Works*, V, 366.

1676. Mr. Oldenburg indulged his "peculiar temper." Mr. Martyn almost forfeited his position as "Printer to the Royal Society." Martyn had championed Hooke in a quarrel with Oldenburg, who had maintained that Hooke had cast aspersions upon his ability in his recent work, *Lampas*, published by Martyn. The Society, however, rallied to Oldenburg's defense. Hooke reported in his Diary, October 8, 1676, that he "had been warned to the Councell of the Royal Society. They decreed nothing against me but against Mr. Martin."[48] The Council took action a few days later. Martyn was summoned before their august presence and ordered to insert an apology in the next issue of the *Transactions:*

> The tract called Lampas . . . printed by John Martyn . . . to which he annexed a postscript reflecting on the publisher of the Transactions [Oldenburg] was printed without the leave or knowledge of the Royal Society, and that the said printer had seen nothing of the postscript thereof before it was printed off, nor knew any ground for the aspersions contained therein. In case the said printer should refuse to obey this order, that the new printer whom the president hath power to constitute in his room be required to signify to the public in print, that Mr. Martyn was removed for disobeying the order of the Council.[49]

It was unnecessary for the Society to engage a new "printer." The issue of November 1676 included a polite retraction, stating that Oldenburg "had carried himself faithfully and honestly in the management of the Intelligence of the Royal Society, and given no just cause of such Reflections."[50]

The exonerated Oldenburg died suddenly in September 1677. The *Transactions* suffered from this loss and appeared sporadically until they were suspended from January 1678/79 to January 1682/83, during which lapse Hooke issued his scientific *Collec-*

[48] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 253; Robert Hooke, *Lampas, or a Description of some Mechanical Improvement of Lamps and Water-Power* (1677).

[49] Birch, *op. cit.*, III, 319.

[50] *Philosophical Transactions*, no. 129 (November 20, 1676).

tions published by Martyn.[51] When the *Philosophical Transactions* reappeared in March 1682/83 they no longer bore the familiar imprint. John Martyn had died in July 1680. His successors were Moses Pitt at The Angel and Samuel Smith at The Princes Arms, St. Paul's Churchyard.

As "Printer to the Royal Society," Martyn had discharged a difficult and exacting task. He had dealt with a cantankerous master; he had obeyed the postulates of an imperious Council, and he had defeated the double-headed monster of pestilence and fire. These he had confronted with courage and spirit. In like manner he discharged his duties as an active and coöperative member of Stationers' Hall and met his responsibilities as the able master of The Bell.

* * * *

Martyn had risen high in the ranks of the Stationers' Company from a young apprentice of Humphrey Robinson in 1634 to Warden of the Company in 1678. From 1675 until his death in July 1680 Martyn was a member of several committees investigating controversies between publishers and authors. In March 1676 he was appointed Company store-keeper with John Wright, Jr. A few months later he was selected with Thomas Roycroft and Thomas Newcomb "to go over accounts since the dreadful Fire in London." The committee had at its disposal "the use of all such books and papers as they shall have occasion for and they are likewise ordered to take an account of what money is out." The following December Martyn had been elected a member of an important judicial committee which was "to read over the By:Laws and settle what is fitt to be done in them in order to the preparing of them for the Judges and to make what additions they think fitt for the better government of the Company."[52]

[51] Robert Hooke, *Lectures and Collections* (1678).

[52] *Order Book Liber E (1674-83)* (MS, Stationers' Hall).

As an older and more conservative member of the Company, Martyn was selected to deal with the obstreperous and offensive stationer, Captain John Seymour. According to Samuel Mearne, Seymour associated only with those considered to be "obnoxious" to the Company. It appears that several booksellers, dissatisfied with Seymour's conduct, had taken themselves to Putney and destroyed Seymour's presses, letters and cases. The offenders were summoned to court and it befell the temperate Martyn and several colleagues to make amends to the unpopular Seymour.[53]

On July 9, 1678, Martyn was elected one of the two Wardens of the Company with the printer John Macocke, Roger Norton being Master.[54] Shortly after the termination of this post Martyn was appointed one of the several delegates sent to the Lord Mayor to seek "some effectuall course for the putting down of Hawkers and Peddlars."[55] This was Martyn's last official assignment, although he appears to have attended meetings regularly until shortly before his death.

As a committee-man, Martyn reflects the status of a successful member of the Company. At the time of his death he had in his employ two apprentices, Henry Faithorne and John Kersey, who, together, after Martyn's death, set up shop at The Rose.[56] For his large and varied stock Martyn had leased a warehouse located "in the Garden next to the City Hall" from his colleague, Samuel Gellibrand, at an annual rental of five pounds.[57]

Martyn had enjoyed uninterrupted prosperity with the exception of a brief period after the Fire. Although Oldenburg declared that "Martyn had been undone with the rest of the Stationers at St. Pauls and all their books burnt," this statement

[53] *Ibid.*; for Seymour, see Plomer, *op. cit.*, *1641-68*, 267.

[54] *Order Book*; see also *Transcript*, III, 68, 86.

[55] *Order Book.*

[56] Plomer, *op. cit.*, *1668-1725*, 114, 178.

[57] *Order Book.*

cannot be proven accurate. It is true that Martyn lost a large stock of the *Transactions* and undoubtedly many of his own publications. Writing to a friend, the antiquarian, William Dugdale, referred to the losses of his books published by Martyn:

I intended to send you books . . . but the lamentable fire hath put an end to my determination having consumed the whole impression [*Origines Juridiciales*] which was just ready for publication and a very few copies saved which with the plates stood me no less than £400 . . . my whole copy except thirty sheets which were printed of the third volume of the Monasticon Anglicanum through the great negligence of my printer.[58]

Martyn cannot be accused of "great negligence." He attempted to save his stock and stored part of it in his own warehouse. A goodly number of his publications appear to have escaped destruction, since copies of works published by him prior to September 1666 were among the stock assigned by Martyn's widow, Sarah, in 1683, to Robert Scott, the London importer of foreign books.[59] At a time when the prospect for the local bookdealer was most dismal, Martyn appears to have been most fortunate in having survived the Fire with some saleable stock. The general outlook for dealer and collector was disheartening. Writing to Clarendon, Evelyn remarked:

Since the late deplorable Conflagration, in wch the stationers have been exceedingly ruined, there is like to be an extraordinary penury and scarcity of classical authors, etc. us'd in our Grammar scholes; so as of necessity they must suddainely [*sic*] be reprinted. This sad calamity has mortified a Company which was exceedingly haughty and difficult to manage.

[58] Quoted in Bell, *op. cit.*, 226. Dugdale may have been referring to his editions: *Origines Juridiciales* (1666) and *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1655-1661).

[59] *Order Book;* the following pre-Fire imprints were consigned by Mrs. Martyn to Scott: *Italian English Dictionary* (1654), Claude Mauger, *French Grammar* (1656), Gilbert Clark, *De plenitudine mundi* (1660), Pietro Maria Canepari, *De atramentis* (1660), Jeremy Taylor, *The Worthy Communicant* (1660), Francis Hall, *Tractatus de Corporum inseparabilitate* (1661), John Evelyn, *Sylva* (1664), Thomas Willis, *Cerebri anatome* (1664), *Philosophical Transactions* (1665, 1666), Robert Hooke, *Micrographia* (1665).

Pepys' *Diary* reflects the general gloomy tone: "A great want thereof there will be of books, especially Latin books and foreign books."[60]

By 1670 Martyn had sufficiently recovered to be able to supply the reader with new publications and "Latin books and foreign books." From 1671 to 1680 Martyn published at least 134 books either alone or in association with other London or provincial booksellers. During the last decade of his career Martyn's interest in the circulation of scientific books shows a considerable increase. Of the books published during this period, an approximate fifty-one relate to the exact and natural sciences, a known thirty-five to theology and nineteen to belles-lettres. For him were printed the writings of Hooke, Malpighi, Grew, Willis and Ray and the aforementioned *Philosophical Transactions*. In the field of literature he published with Herringman in 1676 an edition of *Hamlet* and three years later they issued together the *Works* of Beaumont and Fletcher.

Hooke's *Diary* throws some light upon the existing relationship between the author and the publisher. In March 1673 Hooke had agreed that Martyn publish his *Animadversions on the first Part of the Machina Coelestis of the Astronomer Johann Hevelius*. The work was to be printed by Thomas Roycroft and issued in quarto. Martyn agreed to pay Hooke twenty shillings a signature and the same amount for each illustration. Although the contract had been concluded in March, it was not until October 9th that Hooke delivered the "first part of [his] coppye" to Martyn. Within a week he had prepared additional material and on October 19th the second signature was ready for the press. On November 4th Hooke corrected the proof at Martyn's and a few days later gave him the fifth signature. The plates had been engraved by Lamb and on December 10th Hooke announced: "Book compleat about

[60] William Bray, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn to which are added a Selection from the Familiar Letters* (London, 1906), III, 346; Wheatley, *op. cit.*, II, 310.

Hevelius."[61] A stitched copy sold for two shillings, but Hooke took from his publisher "6 Guilt and 5 plaine Animadversions" some of which he presented to the poet, Captain Sir Edward Sherburne, the mathematician, Sir Jonas Moore, the Lord Chamberlain of London, Sir Thomas Player, Mr. Abraham Hill and the Lord Chief Justice.[62]

As publisher of many editions of Edward Chamberlayne's *Angliae Notitia*, Martyn was eager for an error-proof text. The reader was advised to

> be so courteous as by letter or otherwise to inform the author, printer, or publisher what reasonably ought to be corrected, altered, adduced or left out,

and was reminded that

> information will be very thankfully received and his desire fulfilled in the next edition.[63]

Chamberlayne himself confirmed his publisher's interest in a revised and improved edition. Writing to Sir Joseph Williamson, he had remarked:

> [Mr. Martyn] intends shortly to reprint this with the former part, and bind up both in one volume for some of his customers, and to sell them apart to others. If you can spare any minutes to correct, alter, add, or subtract what may be judged expedient, you will much oblige me.[64]

For the sale of his own publications Martyn employed media similar to those used for the promotion of Society books. Availing himself of his connection with the *Transactions*, Martyn used its issues as an advertising organ. A new edition of Le Grand's *Institutio Philosophiae* was announced as having been "reprinted

[61] For Hooke's composition of the *Animadversions* and its publication, see Robinson, *op. cit.*, 90, 126-129, 134, 135.

[62] Arber, *op. cit.*, I, 196; Robinson, *op. cit.*, 136-138.

[63] Edward Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia* (1679), Postscript to the Reader.

[64] Great Britain. Public Record Office. *Calendar of State Papers. Domestic*, XI, 26.

with many and very considerable additions," while Kersey's *Body of Algebra* "finish't in all its four books; much commended by competent Judges" could be had at The Bell.[65] Approximately 19 books published by Martyn alone or with other dealers were advertised in different issues of *The London Gazette*.[66] A new publication occasionally included a brief note from Martyn to the reader. In the second edition of Woodford's *Paraphrase upon the Psalms of David* he stated that this

> new impression was designed to give the Buyer the greatest satisfaction. The volume is changed from 4to to 8vo, both to make it more portable and to sink its price, but the character as near as could be contrived, the same, if not altered for a much better, that he may have the greater pleasure in reading.[67]

Martyn's most interesting and obvious methods of advertising his stock were sale catalogues which appeared independently or were included in new publications. Martyn's *Catalogue* of 1670, consisting of four pages, printed in quarto, includes forty-eight of his own publications. Of interest among these are *A Compleat Collection of the Philosophical Transactions for the Years 1665, 1667, 1668, and 1669*, Evelyn's *Sylva* and *Kalendarium Hortense*, Hooke's *Micrographia*, Euclid's *Elementa*, Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*, and Acton's *Physical Reflections upon a Letter written by J. Denis*, a commentary upon the Frenchman's principles of blood-transfusion.[68] Martyn appears to have circulated this *Catalogue* along with Number 45 of the *Transactions* for subscribers. It was also available for perusal and general distribution at The Bell. In his 1668 edition of Cordemoy's *Philosophicall Discourse Concerning Speech* Martyn listed at the end nineteen of his publications, many of which were readvertised in the 1670

[65] *Philosophical Transactions*, no. 108 (November 23, 1674).

[66] *The London Gazette*, nos. 417, 483, 504, 538, 624, 628, 673, 685, 686, 729, 909, 989, 1093, 1231, 1245, 1298, 1299, 1379, 1441, 1481.

[67] Samuel Woodford, *A Paraphrase upon the Psalms of David* (1678).

[68] See notes 20, 45; Euclid, *Elementa* (1666), Acton, *Physical Reflections upon a Letter written by J. Denis* (1668).

Catalogue. Here the customer was informed that he might also obtain at The Bell a "Choice of new Latin and French Books."[69] Martyn's 1677 edition of Arnauld's *Logica* listed 21 publications which included his more recent imprints: *Experiments upon Vipers* by Charas, the *Catalogue of English Plants* and *Observations Topographical* by John Ray, Leibnitz's *Hypothesis Physica,* and a nine-year run of the *Philosophical Transactions* bound in three volumes.[70]

Martyn sold at The Bell not only his own publications but the works of English and foreign dealers. He specialized in the field of science and carried a large stock of medical, pharmaceutical and chemical works. Catering to the ingenious and speculative minds of the Society members, Martyn was fully aware of the newest publications in their respective fields of interest. For the wonder-working London Hermes, the master of The Bell imported the most recent abracadabra whose mysteries had been distilled into print by a host of continental pressmen.

Martyn's methods of obtaining an attractive and saleable stock reflect the perennial efforts of an alert bookdealer. He observed collecting whims and encouraged their spread. To meet customers' demands, he purchased collections, advertised particular desiderata, checked catalogues and attended auctions.

As early as 1655, the third year of his partnership with Allestry, Martyn imported the entire library of the distinguished French physician, Jean Riolan. He promptly issued a 128-page catalogue entitled *Catalogus Librorum rei Medicae, Herbariae & Chymiae,* consisting of two parts and listing approximately 3800 books. The first section included medical, chemical and alchemical works, herbals and pharmacopoeia and a few "Libri Magici."

[69] Géraud de Cordemoy, *A Philosophicall Discourse concerning Speech* (1668).

[70] [Antoine Arnauld], *Logica* (1677). Moise Charas, *New Experiments upon Vipers* (1670), John Ray, *Catalogus Plantarum Angliae* (1670), *Observations Topographical, Moral and Physiological* (1673), [Gottfried Leibnitz], *Hypothesis Physica* (1671), *Compleat Collection of Philosophical Transactions* for nine years, 3 vols. in 4to.

Part Two was of a miscellaneous nature including a section of Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syrian and Arabic books with an interspersion of French, Spanish and Italian tracts.[71]

If a customer were unable to find his desideratum in any of Martyn's catalogues, he found his dealer quite prepared to insert a particular title in a Want List. In the March 25, 1675 issue of the *Transactions* Martyn included a list of some "Philosophical and other Curious Books, desired by the Printer of these Tracts (by whom they are vendible)." The list includes 24 titles, many of which reflect the current interest in experimental science: the *Collegium Experimentale* of Johann Christoph Sturm, the *Experimentum Chymicum* of Georg Wedelius, the *Tartarologia Spagirica* of Fridericus Zobelius, and others.[72] The majority of wanted books were printed on the continent, although Martyn was seeking copies of his own publications: Malpighi's *Anatome Plantarum Observationes* and Willughby's *Ornithologia*. Apparently having been encouraged by some success in securing desired books, Martyn issued a similar list of 36 titles in the July 1675 issue of the *Transactions*. Here the alchemist's *potum aureum* was sought in Martyn's advertisement for the *Aurum superius et inferius aurae* of Christian Balduinus, the *Aegyptiorum et Chemicorum Sapientia* of Olaus Borrichius, the *Distillatoria Curiosa* of Johann Elsholtz, and other manuals which were to become the accessories of the fume-filled laboratory.[73]

[71] The Riolan *Catalogue* is extremely rare. It is a small quarto divided into 2 parts: I: 92 pp.; II: 36 pp. It lists about 30 items a page and is unpaged. There is a copy in the Library of the British Museum lacking pp. 3 to 48 inclusive. Information given through the courtesy of F. Geoffrey Rendall, Esq., Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum; *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, II, 99.

[72] *Philosophical Transactions*, no. 112 (March 25, 1675); Johann Sturm, *Collegium Experimentale* (Nuremberg, 1675; vol. II appeared in 1685), Wedelius' title not cited in *Catalogue* of British Museum, Frid. Zobelius, *Tartarologia Spagirica* (Jena, 1676).

[73] "A List of some Philosophical and other Curious Books, desired by the Printer of these Tracts (by whom they are to be had) to be mentioned here," *Philosophical Transactions*, no. 116 (July 26, 1675): Christian Balduinus, *Aurum superius et inferius aurae* (Amsterdam, 1675), Olaus Borrichius, *Aegyptiorum et Chemicorum Sapientia* (Copenhagen, 1674), Johann Elsholtz, *Distillatoria Curiosa* (Berlin, 1674).

As an enterprising bookdealer, Martyn did not neglect to check current trade catalogues. He had at hand copies of Cooper's 1673 *Catalogue of Chymical Works* and the large Elzevier general *Catalogue* of 1674.[74] It is quite possible that he had met Elzevier, since he discussed the Dutch dealer with Hooke. Daniel Elzevier had visited England "on some small business with his correspondents in London of ye same profession." He had been given a letter of introduction to Sir Joseph Williamson, a customer of Martyn, who probably introduced him to the master of The Bell.[75]

Martyn undoubtedly attended many of the current London book auctions of the period: the Kidner Sale of February 1676 held at the King's Head in Little Britain, that of his colleague, John Ogilby, at Jo's Coffee-House, the William Greenhill Collection at the Turk's Head Coffee House in Bread Street, and others. There is every indication that Martyn attended the auction sale of the Benjamin Worsley Library of May 13, 1678, where he bid for Hooke. He purchased eight books for his temperamental customer, who declared that his dealer had acquired them "all too dear by half."[76]

Hooke's criticism echoes the complaint of a wary, yet indulgent customer, one of the many of the distinguished who purchased at The Bell. Despite Pepys' confession of January 10, 1667 to his *Diary* that he "had bought a great many books lately to a great value" and thought "to buy no more till Christmas," he visited Martyn on the very same day of his confession. "There did meet with Fournier, the Frenchman that hath wrote of the Sea and Navigation and I could not but buy him and also be-

[74] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 412, 431.

[75] M. M. Kleerkooper, "Daniel Elseviers Betrekkingen met Engeland" in *Tijdscrift voor Boek-en Bibliotheekwezen* (1910), VIII, 117; Robinson, *op. cit.*, 352: "April 6, 1678, [Hooke] talked with Martin about Eljiver."

[76] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 359-360; see John Lawler, *Book Auctions in England in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1898); issues of *The London Gazette* for the period; Alfred Pollard, "English Book Sales, 1676-1680" in: *Bibliographica*, III, 376 f.

spoke an excellent work which I met here, of China."[77] Pepys appears to have faltered in his New Year's resolutions. In March he purchased a copy of Kircher's *Musurgia* from Martyn and a brief diary entry of a later period reports a visit to Martyn's where he had bought "Cassandra and some French books for my wife's closet."[78]

Among Pepys' contemporaries who called at The Bell were the ubiquitous Hooke; Sir Christopher Wren; Sir John Hoskyns, Master of Chancery and later President of the Royal Society; Mr. Abraham Hill, patron of arts and Treasurer of the Society; Dr. Thomas Gale, Master of St. Paul's School; the tempestuous Oldenburg; the celebrated diplomat, Sir Joseph Williamson; and Thomas Tompion, father of English watchmakers. It was to Tompion that Hooke exhibited at The Bell his new experiment of how "to stay a falling clock-weight by a scaffold pole."[79] Martyn not only welcomed his customers at his business premises, but occasionally supped with them and tippled brew at Man's or Child's Coffee House, traveled with them to Greenwich and Lambeth, and invited them to his new home in Bow Lane.

Early in their partnership, Martyn and Allestry had been eager to please their clients. Writing to a customer in July 1653, Allestry attempted to conciliate an over-zealous collector:

> I perceive you have been at pains to transcribe out of the Frankfurt Catalogue divers books you desire and I am sorry I cannot send them, but it is a very usual thing for the booksellers of Germany to send the titles of books to be put into a catalogue before they are printed, so for the present they are not to be had.[80]

[77] Wheatley, *op. cit.*, II, 766; Georges Fournier, *L'Hydrographie* (Paris, 1643), Alvaro Semmedo, *History of China* (London, 1655).

[78] Wheatley, *op. cit.*, 813, 966; Athanasius Kircher, *Musurgia universalis* (Rome, 1650), Gautier de Costes de la Calprenède, *Cassandre* (Paris, 1644).

[79] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 146.

[80] Adolf Growoll, *Three Centuries of English Booktrade Bibliography* (New York, 1903), 157.

Martyn appears to have conducted his business in a leisurely and calm manner. If Hooke reflects the bibliophilic attitudes of a typical Bell customer, the premises certainly must have proved a collector's haven both intellectually and financially. Here Hooke lingered to discuss new publications, borrow recent imports, select "on approval," return at whim, and wrangle for a price adjustment. On January 2, 1674/75, he purchased Petty's *Discourse . . . concerning the Use of Duplicate Proportion* and Fabre's *Letters* and returned them. The following month he took with him a new statute book: "50 sh. not paid" and Thevenot's *Voyage au Levant* "6 sh. not paid." A few days later he purchased another six books which were to be put on account. The following day, however, he received a "bill of books from Mr. Martin."[81] Later, he returned Keppler's *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae* which he had "struck out of the bill." On April 12, 1676, Hooke reported that he had

> reccon'd with Mr. Martin at The Bell. I took of Ghetaldus De Revolutione et Compositione and Archimedes Redivivus at 11sh. ea. He owed me 25 sh and I owed him 21 sh for a book, upon ballancing the account he owed me 4 sh. Took home a book from Martin and returned Oldenburg Piso. I had of him last week Ornithologia Willughbis for 24s. Saw new edition of Josephus.[82]

At an earlier period Hooke had triumphantly noted: "At Martins. Blunt's Law Dictionary 8s. My price 6s.6d."[83] Martyn, however, did not always agree to Hooke's persuasion. He re-

[81] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 139, 145, 146, 195; William Petty, *Discourse made before the Royal Society 26 November 1674 concerning the Use of Duplicate Proportion* (London, 1674); Pierre Jean Fabre, title unrecorded—Hooke may have been referring to the *Opera* (Frankfurt, 1652); Jean Thévenot, *Relation d'un Voyage fait au Levant* (Paris, 1665, 1674).

[82] *Ibid.*, 225; Johann Keppler, *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae* (Linz, 1618-22), Marinus Ghetaldus, *De Resolutione et Compositione Mathematica Libri Quinque* (Rome, 1540), Hooke may have been referring to the Archimedes, *Opera* (London, 1675), Oldenburg's copy of Gulielmus Piso, *De Indiae utriusque Re Naturali, et Medica libri quatuordecim* (Amsterdam, 1658).

[83] *Ibid.*, 136; Thomas Blount, *Νομο λεξικον: a law Dictionary* (London, 1670).

mained steadfast in his set price of two pounds for Stanley's *History of Philosophy* to which the scientist failed to agree. Occasionally Hooke attempted to barter with Martyn for a better buy. "Having bought of Miller at The Starr Oughtred's Opuscula 2 sh. saw at Mr. Martins Rays Ornithologia in English with additions, he refused to exchange." At times, however, a successful swap between the dealer and customer was effected. Hooke gave Martyn 40 issues of the *Philosophical Transactions* for which he received fifty-six in return. It is quite certain that Mr. Martyn did not envisage any loss in this transaction. He undoubtedly had eager customers for certain issues in Hooke's lot, and in accepting his pet bibliophile's proposal he met his wish and satisfied the scientist's latent business acumen.[84]

In October 1677 Hooke took "on approval" from Martyn, Sorbiere's *Voyage en Angleterre* and in early December a tract by Kircher. On December 27th the unabashed scientist returned both works along with seven others. Poor Martyn![85]

Hooke apparently regarded The Bell as a lending library and often borrowed many foreign imports, which he returned at his own convenience, or occasionally remained sufficiently long at the premises to complete his day's reading. On February 14, 1676, he noted: "To Martins read Zwelfer's *Pharmacopeia Augustana.*"[86]

On March 3, 1679/80, Hooke visited Martyn. He visited him not at The Bell but at his new home in Bow Lane. He came not as a customer but as a friend. Martyn had taken ill. On July 5, 1680, Hooke briefly recorded: "Mr. Martin at The Bell died." A week later, on July 13, 1680, Martyn's faithful custo-

[84] *Ibid.*, 237, 316, 311; Thomas Stanley, *History of Philosophy* (London, 1659-60), William Oughtred, *Opuscula Mathematica* (Oxford, 1677).

[85] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 322, 331, 336; Samuel Sorbière, *Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre* (Paris, 1664).

[86] *Ibid.*, 274; Zwelfer, *Pharmacopeia Augustana reformata* (Dordrecht, 1672).

mer and friend attended his obsequies. Martyn was interred in the restored Chapel of St. Faith, where a monument was erected to his memory, depicting the late Master of The Bell kneeling and at his side a stack of books.[87]

Martyn's widow, Sarah, survived him. To the stationers' ranks she presented a silver bowl weighing 69 ounces, 18 pennyweight, in discharge of her husband's legacy of 20 pounds to his Company.[87a] In January 1680/81 Mrs. Martyn was compelled to deliver to the Stationers' Company for their use all papers, warrants and other things belonging to the Company which were in her custody.[88] Although Joseph Moxon had desired Martyn's premises, the celebrated pressman was not fortunate in securing them.[89] On June 14, 1681, Mrs. Martyn concluded an agreement with Robert Scott, the London importer, to assign her husband's stock to him. The following month she appeared before the Stationers' Court requesting formally that the books be assigned to Scott. Her petition was complied with and she was instructed that the "Catalogue should be read to the Table the next generall Court and right be done her."[90]

By November 1681, Scott had completed his purchase of Martyn's stock, but appears to have been somewhat dissatisfied with his new holdings. He presented to the Court a list of 361 titles, stating that there were

many books of little or noe value and not about twenty of them worth the entring yet offered that if the Company would sett a lower rate than usuall (in regard they were soo numerous) he would for order of methods sake enter all in the Companys register Booke. Otherwise he must be constrained to enter but twenty or thereabouts which the Court taking into

[87] *Ibid.*, 440, 448; Dunton, *op. cit.*, 212: "[Martyn] made a very pious end." John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1812-5), III, 598, n. 1.

[87a] Nichols, *op. cit.*, III, 598, n. 1.

[88] *Order Book*, 3 Jan. 1680/81.

[89] Robinson, *op. cit.*, 448.

[90] *Transcript*, III, 181; *Order Book*, 4 July 1681.

consideration ordered that they shall be entered in the Register Book for this Company for the said Mr. Robert Scott for fifty shillings.[91]

Scott registered the 361 titles on August 21, 1683, according to the Court's instructions of November 1681.[92] He probably belittled the quality of his purchase in order to reduce the registration fee. Among the books transferred to him were many of Martyn's most important imprints: the works of Hooke, Ray, Evelyn, Malpighi, Willis, the *Philosophical Transactions*, the plays of Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, and many others.

By 1686, Mrs. Martyn, who, in the meantime, had become Mrs. Thomas Hutchinson, wife of a divine, received the final payment for her late husband's estate, a total of 160 pounds, the equivalent to a livery part in the English Stock of the Company of Stationers, which had been held by Martyn.[93]

Although the estate of John Martyn was now finally closed, the books he published were to live as landmarks in the history of science. Martyn's career represents the achievements of an outstanding London publisher and bookseller. In the selection of the master of The Bell as "Printer to the Royal Society," the intellectual coterie of the capital indicated its appreciation of a reliable and sympathetic craftsman, and in Martyn's association with the Restoration *cognoscenti* his own discernment of scholarship is patent. By his dissemination of books of scientific inquiry he guided the reader to new channels of learning and stimulated interest in hitherto unploughed fields of experiment and observation. As a coöperative member of his guild, he served his company well. His customers and methods of sale suggest the happy relationship between a reliable bookseller and discerning, intelligent collectors. His rehabilitation after the Fire and his preservation of pre-Fire imprints indicate that the damage created by

[91] *Order Book*, 7 November 1681.

[92] *Transcript*, III, 181-190.

[93] *A Book of Receipts for Shares in the English Stock*, October 4, 1686 (MS, Stationers' Hall).

the disaster was not quite so overwhelming as has been popularly believed.

To the host of names which stimulated the intellectual and scientific development of the English Restoration may be added that of John Martyn who, by the books he published and sold, helped preserve for posterity an indelible record of an age of diverse experimentation, abounding curiosity and enviable genius.

The Book Trade and the Protective Tariff: 1800-1804

By Rollo G. Silver

CHARACTERISTICALLY mindful of its obligation to American manufacturers, the Congress of 1789 lost no time in preparing and passing a tariff act. Although printed books received no specific mention in this law, they were subject, nevertheless, to the duty of five per cent charged on "all other goods." During the following decade, the growing book trade received further aid when the five per cent was increased to seven and a half per cent in 1792, to ten per cent in 1794, and to twelve and a half per cent in 1800. Thus printers began to relish the sweet taste of protection from the competition provided by English imports; this was particularly true in Philadelphia, at that time the major center of the book industry.

Realizing their favored position, the printers naturally desired to see it continue—and pressed for the highest possible rate of duty. Unlike many members of other growing industries, they possessed good equipment for pressure politics: a wealth of newspaper experience and a functioning trade organization. The existence of this early trade organization, it must be noted, has not hitherto been established in American typographical history. Barnett suspected its existence, but knew of no definite evidence to sustain his conjectures.[1] The following advertisement, therefore, is of interest because it discloses that the Philadelphia Typographical Society, organized in 1802, did have a predecessor:

[1] G. E. Barnett, "The Printers," *American Economic Association Quarterly*, 3rd ser., X (Oct. 1909), 436-437.

A Special Meeting of the Subscribers to the *Asylum Company of Journeymen Printers*, will be held at Mr. Cook's, Black horse alley, on Saturday evening the 13th inst, at 7 o'clock precisely.

The Journeymen Printers in general are requested to attend at this meeting.

By order of the Committee of Superintendance.

Philadelphia, Dec. 6, 1800.[2]

The reason for extending a general invitation to all printers is apparent when one reads a notice published two days later:

At a Meeting of the COMMITTEE OF SUPERINTENDANCE *of the* ASYLUM COMPANY OF JOURNEYMEN PRINTERS, *of the City of Philadelphia, held on Saturday, the 6th of Dec. 1800:—*

Resolved, That a respectful Memorial be presented to the Congress of the United States, praying, that an additional duty may be laid on Books imported into this country—those for the use of public Libraries excepted.

Ordered, That said Resolution be published; and that all *Journeymen Printers*, not members of the said Company, desirous of signing the said Memorial, be requested to come forward for that purpose, on Saturday Evening, the 13th December.[3]

In the meantime, the members of the Asylum Company started to garner even more signatures by communicating with their fellow printers in the vicinity. The Baltimore newspapers printed this notice:

The Journeymen Printers of this city are requested to attend at Mrs. Otto's tavern, To-Morrow Evening, *precisely at half past seven o'clock. They are invited to sign a memorial from the "Asylum Company of Journeymen Printers," to the congress of the United States, praying that an additional duty may be laid on books imported into this country—those for the use of public libraries excepted.*[4]

The memorial was sent to Congress and read in the House of Representatives on January 14, 1801. Unfortunately, it cannot

[2] *Philadelphia Gazette*, Dec. 6, 1800, p. 2, col. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*, Dec. 8, 1800, p. 2, col. 3.

[4] *Federal Gazette*, Dec. 11, 1800, p. 3, col. 3. Another notice is in *Baltimore Telegraphe*, Dec. 12, 1800, p. 3, col. 3.

be found in the National Archives.[5] However, the records of the House of Representatives reveal that the petition was referred to the Committee of Commerce and Manufactures. On February 2, 1801, when the Committee reported back, the House resolved that "it is inexpedient at this time, farther to increase the duties on imported articles."

The printers may have been disheartened by this rebuff, but they were certainly not discouraged. A year later, the Baltimore journeymen resumed the campaign started by their brethren in Philadelphia and this time a plan of action was prepared. First they decided to communicate with their fellow workers in other cities in an effort to secure national coverage for their proposal. This letter was set in type, printed, and distributed to printers throughout the states:

Baltimore, March 22, 1802.

WE have the honor to inform you, that at a meeting of the Printers, Booksellers, Bookbinders and Papermakers of this city, held on Thursday evening, the 18th instant, we were chosen a committee, to communicate by circular, with the Printers of Philadelphia, New-York and Boston: —Among the characters, whom we deem it necessary to address on the occasion, we have selected you; sincerely impressed with the opinion, that you will feel a lively interest in the subject, which, at present, it becomes our duty to invite your attention to. It is of a nature, which involves in its issue, the interest, respectability, and even the security of the *Printing business*, in this country.

After premising thus much, we proceed to state to you, that the object of the meeting was, to take into consideration, the expediency of petitioning Congress, to lay a further duty on Books, either bound or in sheets, which may hereafter be imported. The propriety of the measure, as you must certainly calculate, was unanimously sanctioned;—and, in conformity thereto, a memorial would have been drafted; but a consideration, embracing a respect for the Printers of the cities enumerated—on the score of preeminence—and the more powerful impulse, that such a measure originating in either of these cities, would be more likely to succeed, induced the meeting to omit an immediate application to the memorial

[5] Letter from Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, March 2, 1951.

concern, and instead thereof, nominated us to solicit you, to engage in the business without delay, in order that we may make general arrangements before the close of the present session of Congress. We hope, therefore, that you will immediately call a meeting of those interested, and we assure you, that our most zealous cooperation shall not be wanting.

The importance of the subject in question, must appear evident to every Printer in the United States—and, there is not an individual in the line, who does not, more or less, experience the baneful effects arising from the great press of imported Books:—and this evil, it is seriously apprehended, will greatly increase, in consequence of the peace establishment in Europe. So much does it at present sap the Printing business, that many of us are obliged to beg subscribers, before we can venture to print, even a dollar volume.—This kind of humiliation we must sometimes submit to, or otherwise, suffer for the want of employment. On the other hand, if an efficient duty can be obtained, to prevent that injurious rivalship which now operates against us; it will secure us, a comfortable support, by affording us constant employ—which by extending our sphere of action, will bring those energies into operation, which now too often lie dormant:— and thus, released from embarrassments, the Printers in this country, *from their number*, will be enabled to furnish the consumers, on more moderate terms, than they are now supplied by the aid of European speculations.

But as Printers, in endeavoring to benefit ourselves, we would not selfishly forget our neighbors; in using exertions to obtain the end in view, we would clash as little as possible, with individual or public good. To the interests of literature, every attention should be paid; therefore it is proposed, that the contemplated increase of duty, shall extend, only, to publications printed in the English language; with the exceptions that now exist, and such further exceptions as your experience may prompt you to make.

We beg leave to notice, that Books in sheets should be particularized, as the importer, may otherwise, evade the force of the law, by classing such, under the designation of stationary.

From the view we have taken of the subject, (though an imperfect one) the grievance appears obvious, and the remedy, if properly applied for, seems certain; for no inconvenience can arise to the public; but, on the other hand, an increase of revenue to the country. On this ground, Congress will see the utility of favoring our united petition, in doing which, a spirit of virtuous industry will be excited and maintained;—an internal

saving will accrue—and from this will arise, the consequent benefits of a large circulating medium, at home, which is now profusely thrown in the lap of commercial averice *(sic)*, abroad.

We will not reflect on your penetration, by pursuing this subject any further; but conclude, by referring you, to a report of the committee of commerce and manufactures, laid before Congress some time in last month:—from this it appears, that a truly patriotic spirit influences the committee, who seem desirous of affording every patronage to the manufactures of their country. In this report, even the type-founders are noticed, as objects, to whom the aid of government should extend, notwithstanding, the manufactures in that line, can only supply the country with a small part of its demand.[6] This consideration strengthens our confidence of success, and we fondly hope, it will have the same invigorating effect on you.

We remain,
very respectfully,
your obedient servants,

JOHN HAYES,
WILLIAM PECHIN,
ANDREW HANNA. } Committee.

Approved by the meeting.

[*signed*] John Hagerty Chairman[7]

About the time this letter was issued, the Asylum Company was probably dissolved. There is no definite evidence regarding this, but when the Philadelphia Typographical Society was being organized on November 13, 1802, "a committee was appointed to obtain the books and papers of 'the former Asylum Company.'"[8] By November, the Baltimore circular letter had stimulated some action. Nichols, in his essay on literary fairs,

[6] In 1800, Binny & Ronaldson, the typefounders, petitioned Congress for cancellation of the duty on regulus of antimony. When the committee reported back, on Feb. 10, 1802, it recommended that the duty be lifted and that the duty on imported types be increased because "such manufactures as are obviously capable of affording to the United States an adequate supply . . . ought to be promoted by the aid of Government" (*American State Papers*, ed. Walter Lowrie and Matthew StC. Clarke, Washington, 1832, V, 730).

[7] Reprinted by courtesy of the New-York Historical Society. Grateful acknowledgement is made to Mr. Roger Bristol for the locating of this letter.

[8] Barnett, *loc. cit.*

points out that Ebenezer J. Andrews, of Thomas & Andrews, thought an additional duty premature because the book trade was not equipped "to answer the demands of the public." Andrews cited college texts as an example. However, in New York printers were proceeding according to their plan. The minutes of the directors of the Philadelphia Typographical Society record the following for the meeting of December 11, 1802:

> The President having read to the Directors a letter received from the Franklin Typographical Association of New York, intimating their appointment of a Committee for the purpose of draughting a petition to Congress for laying an additional duty on imported European books — —
>
> Resolved that a Committee of three be appointed to draught a memorial to Congress for laying an additional duty on European imported books, bound or in sheets—to report at the next meeting of the Directors, Committee, Messrs. Childs, Little, and Graves.
>
> Resolved that the President communicate to the Franklin Typographical Association of New York, the result of the letter received from them.[9]

On December 18, 1802,

> The Directors met and proceeded to business. The Committee for the purpose of drafting a Memorial to Congress for laying an additional duty on Books reported — — the Memorial was read, and received the approbation of the Board of Directors.
>
> Resolved, that the Memorial be signed by the Officers of the Society, and the Board of Directors — —
>
> Resolved, that the Memorial be remitted by the President, to Mr. Logan, Senator, and Mr. Jones, member of Congress.

This is the petition read in the House of Representatives on January 4, 1803:

> To the honourable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled.
>
> The Petition of the Subscribers, Journeymen Printers of the City of Philadelphia;

[9] All quotations from the minutes of the Philadelphia Typographical Society are transcribed, with minor changes in punctuation, from the copy in the Johns Hopkins University Library. Grateful acknowledgement is made to Dr. Homer Halvorson and to Mr. J. Louis Kuethe.

Humbly sheweth; —

That your Petitioners, during a great part of the year, and particularly during the recess of your honourable body, are repressed in that spirit of industry, by which they would wish to be characterized, through the great influx of Books imported from foreign countries, — that the spirit which has lately been shewn by some of their Employers, in executing works in a style, equal, if not superior to European publications, proves, that nothing is wanting but the fostering aid of government, assisted by a discerning public, to render that spirit general, and to give to the productions of the American Press, that credit which Europe has spent ages in acquiring. . . . They, therefore, pray, that your honourable body will lay such additional duties upon Books imported into the United States from foreign countries (those for the use of public Incorporated Libraries excepted,) as, in your wisdom may seem meet and proper — and, your Petitioners will as in duty bound, pray — — —

Signed by order, and in behalf of the Philadelphia Typographical Society.

Geo: White President	M: Childs	W^{m} Hanley
Henry Garson V. P.	Tho^{s} B. Abercrombie	Tho^{s}. Dalton
William Little Sec'ry	John Alexander	Directors of the
Barth^{w} Graves Treasurer	James Winnard	Philad^{a} Typographical
	Gabriel Barnhill	Society[10]
	Edw^{d} Whitely	
	Horatio Boate	
	Alex Scott	

A similar petition, read in the Senate on January 5, 1803, was tabled. On January 22, 1803, the Directors of the Philadelphia Typographical Society resolved to insert the replies of the representatives in the minutes. Since these replies are excellent examples of legislative tact and because they explain the tabling of the Senate document, they are printed:

Washington Jany 6th 1803

Dear Sir

Agreeably to your request, I presented to Senate the Memorial forwarded to me — — Every subject of the nature of your application com-

[10] The petitions in this paper are printed, with minor changes in punctuation, from photostats supplied by the National Archives.

mences with the House of Representatives — — Should your Petition meet with the approbation of that Body, on its coming before the Senate, it shall receive my particular attention.

With sentiments of respect to yourself and associates

I am your friend

Mr. Geo White (signed) Geo. Logan[11]

Sir:

The petition which you enclosed to me, in behalf of the Typographical Society was received, presented to Congress and referred to the appropriate Committee, that of Commerce and manufactures — —

You are correct in the opinion, that I feel an interest in the productions of my own Country — — and this interest will induce me to give your application all the countenance in my power — —

With sentiments of respect for you and the Association over which you preside

I am yours

Mr. Geo. White (signed) M Leib[12]

Precisely three weeks after the memorial from Philadelphia was read in the House, memorials from printers in New York, Boston, and Baltimore were presented. Because of the present emergency the National Archives is unable to supply a photostat of the petition from Baltimore. However, the other two provide an intimate, if prejudiced, view of the American printer in 1803:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

In Congress assembled.

The Subscribers, Committee in behalf of the "Boston Franklin Association," or Journeymen Printers of Boston; beg leave humbly to present the following Memorial: —

Considering, that every body politic, & in certain cases even individuals, have the privilege, at all times in a proper and respectful manner, to lay their grievances before the Councils of the Nation, for attention, & redress: — That Congress will always endeavor to support & extend the interests of their own Country, in preference to those of other Nations: —

[11] George Logan (1753-1821), Senator from Pennsylvania, 1801-1807.

[12] Michael Leib (1760-1822), Representative from Pennsylvania, 1799-1806.

That, when the Articles of Foreign Countries, by their easy importation and circulation among us, become in their nature so as to damp the ardor & enterprize of our Fellow-Citizens; to keep back local improvements; & to materially injure our best hopes & exertions; — Congress may be led to seek prompt & wholesome correctives; & extend liberal encouragement to native industry & suffering prosperity: —

We further beg leave to observe: — That the numerous Class of Printers in the U. S. A. almost universally suffer by the free ingress which the Publications of other Countries are allowed to have among us; — That were there an additional and discriminating duty laid on Foreign Imported Books, it would give great encouragement to the American Press and manufactures connected with it; — That owing to the great influx of foreign works, the American Printers find no encouragement to use either exertion or expence to raise the typographical character of our Country above mediocrity either in point of *ornament*, *impression*, or *paper:* — From this little encouragement given the American Press arises many unhappy effects, not only to the Masters, but the Journeymen & young men generally who calculate on business & support. The American able to surpass the European in the correctness and elegance of his Art, sees no encouraging hand held out by his Government to stimulate or support him; he sinks in silent dejection! — while the European, triumphing over him, by the trifle he has to pay for admission, views his dejected industry & patriotism with a grin or a sneer!

We, therefore, humbly pray & fervently hope, that such an additional & discriminating Duty may be laid on imported Publications, as Congress in their wisdom shall think best calculated to encourage the American Press.

Wm Burdick
Nathl. Willis, Junr
Joshua Belcher
Edward Gray, jun. } Committee.
Howard S. Robinson
Calvin Day and
Josiah Ball

Boston,/ Masa./ Jan. 11, 1803.

To the Representatives of the People of the United States, in Congress assembled

The Memorial of the Franklin Typographical Association of New York — *Humbly sheweth,*

That your Memorialists conceive, when any portion of the People of these States feel themselves aggrieved in any manner, whether arising from an Act of the General Legislature, or from Causes which it is in the Power of *that* respected Body to correct, that they have an undoubted right, and it becomes their bounden duty, to lay the same before *you*, to be redressed in such manners as you, in your wisdom, may think meet.

Impressed with sentiments of this Nature, and aware of their importance; convinced of your uprightness and the justice of our claim, to you, as the Fathers and [one word undecipherable] of our common Country, we, with all due deference, make our appeal.

The Boon we have to solicit is, that Congress please to lay an additional Duty upon all *Books* which may be imported into the United States from Great Britain, or other Countries, (except those printed in the dead characters,) whether in Sheets or otherwise. This measure, we trust, will neither be unwise or impolitic.

Within a very few years, the professors of the Art of Printing in this Country, have rapidly increased in number, and progressed in improvement; but from the quantity of Books imported from foreign Countries, we find many of them necessitated to pursue other avocations as the means of obtaining a comfortable support, or to linger out an existence on a bare sufficiency to supply the calls of nature.

Amongst the great mass of Books imported, many are found of a loose and trifling nature, tending to corrupt the morals of our citizens. Congress, by laying the solicited Duty, would enable the Professors of the Art to select and print such compositions only as would be really advantageous; and we feel confident in asserting, that a sufficient number of those can be printed in a cheap and elegant manner, to satisfy all demands, provided a law be enacted agreeably to the Prayer of your Memorialists.

We further beg leave to remark, that we are not altogether self-interested in this application: — No! we anticipate the numerous advantages that will likewise accrue to a large and respectable body of our fellow citizens — the Paper-makers, Engravers, Bookbinders, and many who profess mechanism, by promoting amongst them a spirit of enterprize, emulation and industry.

In addition to the request we have made, we wish that such measures should be taken as may prevent teachers of private Schools from importing Books free of Duty, and afterwards disposing of them at the prices received by the Booksellers; a practice which we have reason to believe has taken place under sanction, or rather, misconstruction of the Law exempt-

ing from Duty all Books and Philosophical Apparatus imported for the use of public Libraries and Seminaries, which is particularly injurious to the interests of our Business.

We have now laid before your Honorable Body the grounds of our complaint, as well as the means by which you may redress it; and relying on your wisdom and justice, we pray for such relief in the premises as you may think the case merits.

(signed) H. Sage, *President*
John Collins, Secretary
In behalf of eighty-nine Members.

All these petitions were referred to the Committee of Commerce and Manufactures. On February 21, 1803, the committee reported back, and the House, adopting their report, resolved that

the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to prepare and lay before Congress, early in their next session, a plan for the levying new and more specific duties . . .[13]

Undismayed, the members of the Philadelphia book trade continued to seek additional favors from the government. On February 14, 1804,

A memorial of sundry booksellers and printers of the city of Philadelphia, in the state of Pennsylvania, whose names are thereunto subscribed, was presented to the House, and read, praying a remission or reduction of the duty at present imposed by law, on such raw materials imported from foreign countries, as are used in the various branches of business carried on by the memorialists, for the reasons therein stated.

Ordered, That the said memorial be referred to the committee of the whole House.[14]

The memorial cannot be found.[15] Therefore, it is not possible to determine the precise objectives, nor the degree of success

[13] *Journal of the House of Representatives of the United States* (Washington, 1826), IV, 356.

[14] *Journal of the House of Representatives* (Washington, Samuel H. Smith, n.d.), p. 415.

[15] Letter from Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, March 2, 1951.

achieved. However, a reading of the Tariff Act of March 27, 1804, shows that Congress had forgotten about the earlier petitions: books were not mentioned.

These episodes in the struggle of the American printer to achieve independence from English monopoly are parallel to the larger and more formidable revolts in our early history. To the Philadelphia printer his cause was as vital as that of a generation before him and it was part of his heritage to call meetings and address Congress in the firm measured language of the great petitions of another day. In his words are the undertones of isolationism, of continued bitterness towards England that were to evidence themselves in the War of 1812.

Concurrent Printing: An Analysis of Dodsley's *Collection of Poems by Several Hands*

By William B. Todd

IMPLICIT in most accounts of presswork on hand-printed books is the convenient assumption that, at a given time, the entire resources of the shop are devoted to the production of a single work. Not infrequently, of course, evidence such as that provided by headlines may indicate a disruption or distribution of labor, but even this fails to identify the occasion or extent of the disarrangement. Since it is, therefore, indeterminate, all activity other than that relating to the book under investigation is generally discounted in our speculations. A certain discretion common to most authorities, including bibliographers, moves us to view the unknown as unmentionable.

Yet we may suppose that other work is engaged, and occasionally to such an extent that it should be regarded as concurrent printing. In the larger establishments of the eighteenth century, particularly, the facilities were certainly adequate for simultaneous work on several projects, involving, in some instances, independent groups of compositors and pressmen, in others, the same group intermittently employed, first on a few sheets of one book, then on a few of another. Under the first circumstance each book would constitute a separate venture, though produced concurrently with others, and thus contain, insofar as this can be ascertained, all the evidence of its manufacture. In effect, then, books of this sort are no different from others produced in the usual manner and need not concern us further. Under the sec-

ond condition, on the other hand, the book is only one of several components in a more extensive enterprise, and thus exhibits only a portion of the information necessary for its analysis. Until the other portions have been located and the various pieces reassembled in the pattern originally devised the puzzle will remain insolvable.

Fortunately, for our purpose, where the latter condition most often prevails—in the eighteenth century—the means for its solution may often be found in the press figures. These convenient indices, if properly interpreted,[1] not only identify the number of pressmen employed in the shop but usually account for their activities. The figures, though, are not entirely reliable. Sometimes, when the work has been prearranged, the men operate without numbers. On other occasions, so far as we know, several of the men may be temporarily unemployed. Moreover, there is also the difficulty of identifying all the books concurrently printed at a certain time and place. Nevertheless, despite these handicaps, any extension of the investigation beyond the confines of a single work may lead to an approximation which, though still removed from the facts, represents an advance in that direction. The approach to be made in the first section, below, allows us to interpret, in the second, a remarkable event in publishing history which has, thus far, escaped the attention of bibliographers.

I

To exemplify what may be adduced from a correlation of the press figures in several books I have selected the 1758 series of octavo volumes titled *A Collection of Poems By Several Hands*, all printed by John Hughs for publication by Robert Dodsley.[2]

[1] The hypothesis advanced in this paper evolves from the theories discussed in my "Observations on the Incidence and Interpretation of Press Figures," in: *Studies in Bibliography*, III (1950), 171-205.

[2] Hughs is one of the very few 18th century printers who identifies his work. That of the others can only be determined through the several printers' registers now extant or through the use of certain ornaments. For an interesting application of the latter method see William Merritt Sale's *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1950).

This comprises the fifth edition of volumes I-III, the second edition of IV, and—as the figures disclose—two previously undifferentiated "first editions" of V-VI.[3] All eight volumes are interrelated, either as double or triple productions; but none, separately or in combination, fully account for the available labor in Hugh's establishment. Thus, as always in bibliographical discussions, the evidence is incomplete. What there is, however, allows a division of the recorded labor into six phases, of which the last, as the most obvious instance of concurrent printing, may be presented first.

Table I

Phase 6. Presswork on "B" edition
[To facilitate comparison I have reversed the sequence of data in the third column]

Volume V			Volume VI	
A1^{v}(i)4	A3^{v}(i)3		1(i)A5^{v}	
	B8^{r}(i)1	=	1(i)B7^{v}	
	C8^{v}(o)3	=	3(i)C8^{r}	
D7^{r}(o)1	D5^{v}(i)2	~	2(i)D7^{v}	D8^{v}(o)3
	E8^{v}(o)1	=	1(i)E7^{v}	
	F1^{v}(i)4	=	4(i)F8^{r}	
	G2^{v}(o)1		2(i)G6^{r}	
	H4^{v}(o)1		2(o)H5^{r}	
I1^{v}(i)3	I2^{v}(o)4		1(i)I7^{v}	
	K5^{v}(i)4	~	4(i)K7^{v}	K8^{v}(o)1
	L3^{v}(i)3		1(i)L1^{v}	
	M7^{v}(i)3		2(i)M6^{r}	
	N5^{v}(i)4		2(i)N6^{r}	
	O1^{v}(i)3	=	3(i)O8^{r}	

[3] These may be distinguished by the figures to be reported or, more conveniently, by the presence of an errata list on V, 332, in the actual first edition. I have belatedly discovered that the first four volumes also exist in two editions: one, as described in the text, with chainlines running horizontally throughout and with points generally corresponding to those reported by R. W. Chapman (in *Oxford Biblio. Soc. Proceedings and Papers,* III [1931-33], 272); the other, also designated for I-III as a "fifth" and for IV as a "second" edition, but with a variant set of figures, chainlines running vertically throughout, and points usually differing from those cited by Chapman. This other set, represented by copies at the Duke Library, was, I surmise, printed at some later time when (as observed in the discussion of "A" edition V-VI) the vertical paper replaced the horizontal variety. Unlike the original 1758 set, this reveals no indication of concurrent printing.

	P8^{r}(i)4		3(i)P1^{v}
	Q7^{v}(i)4		3(i)Q5^{v}
R6^{v}(o)1	R3^{v}(i)3	~	3(o)R2^{v}
S2^{v}(o)3	S7^{v}(i)2	~	2(o)S5^{r}
	T1^{v}(i)1		3(i)T7^{v}
	U5^{v}(i)2	=	2(i)U1^{v}
	X *none*		3(i)X3^{v}

This concerns edition "B" of the fifth and sixth volumes, both produced by four pressmen whose work on this assignment, as the first table shows, is only incidental.[4] Generally only one man can be spared from some other job, and this individual successively prints and perfects, as illustrated by the equation signs, first a certain signature in one volume, then the corresponding signature in the other.[5] For this, and for a similar practice in the "A" edition, the only explanation seems to be that, whenever practicable, the sheets were passed through the press in parallel order so that both volumes could be completed and published at the same time.[6] On four occasions, those denoted by the equivalent symbol, the one individual has, in conformity with this practice, done most of the work before another (in D, two others) arrives to finish off an outer forme. At other times, as marked by parallels, two men are available from the beginning, 1-2 in the first instance, 2-3 in the second, and 3-4 in the third. Though the assignment for each is four formes, equal to that for one man

[4] For this and later tabulations the entries refer, in order, to page (forme) press figure. In this list two entries, both for the fifth volume, require notation. One relates to the double figure in the inner forme of A, not evidence of cancellation, apparently, but of some mixup in the assignments prior to impression. The other pertains to C, which, in what I believe to be its original state (copy NN), bears only the one figure, as cited, but later (in copies DLC and NcU) also registers C1^{v}(i)1 —presumably an indication that 1 finishes up the remaining sheets of this forme.

[5] From the evidence of other books (cf. my study, *op. cit.*) it appears that the register of one figure to a sheet marks sequential work (one forme after another at the same press), the register of two, simultaneous work (the two formes laid on different presses).

[6] Volumes V and VI edition "A" were, in fact, published together (cf. fn. 18). Both in this and in the "B" edition the volume reference on $1 of each set would prevent an intermixture and enable the binder to arrange the piles for collation.

operating independently, the work in this case extends sequentially through two signatures of the same volume. Except for the occasional employment of a third man, which serves to lower the average, the assignment suggests that this is the labor performed each week, the normal pay period. If so, the number of copies applied to each forme, and thus the size of the issue, totals 3000.[7]

While incidental work of the order evident in "B" volumes V and VI would necessitate figuring as a means of checking labor other than that regularly assigned, such a practice would not be required for predetermined work. Volumes I and II, constituting the first phase, represent such an assignment. Since each volume is unfigured, both were probably impressed concurrently according to some schedule known to the overseer, but not revealed to the bibliographer.

Beginning with the second phase, concerning the work on signatures A-P of volume III, the figures reappear, but in such a manner as to be completely uninformative:

E7^{r}(o)2 G4^{v}(o)3 H8^{v}(o)2 K5^{r}(o)3 M5^{r}(o)3 P4^{v}(o)3

From this the only conclusion to be drawn is that we are again dealing with piecework and that the major project, at this time, is to be discovered either in I and II (where nothing can be determined) or outside the present series of volumes.

In the third phase, however, a pattern emerges of a kind quite similar to that previously described. This operation concerns the remaining signatures of the third volume and the first eleven of the fourth, two sequences machined concurrently and, on this occasion, alternately, by the pressmen designated as 2 and 5.

III	Q5^{v}(i)5	R2^{v}(o)2	S8^{v}(o)5	T8^{r}(i)2	U7^{v}(i)5	X4^{v}(o)2	Y7^{r}(o)2
IV	A4^{v}(o)5	BC *none*	D1^{v}(i)5	E6^{v}(o)2	F4^{v}(o)5	I6^{r}(i)2	L7^{r}(o)2
					GH *none*	K *none*	

[7] This calculation is based on Stower's estimate that a man at "full press" (with an assistant) can print 2000 copies a day. If six days are allowed for four formes, one and one-half days are required for each. *The Printer's Grammar* (London, 1808), p. 527.

As we see, the correspondence between the two sets of figures is almost perfect.[8] Here, as before, the men are simultaneously working the sheets of two volumes. But again, as before, the greater amount of labor among the five men known to be in Hugh's employ is expended elsewhere.

It is only when we come to the fourth phase that we find the majority of the pressmen continually, if erratically, at work. At this time three sequences are going through the presses, the remaining signatures for the fourth volume, and all except a few of those for the "A" edition of the fifth and sixth. As three men were now engaged, numbers 2, 3, and 5, one would suppose that each should be assigned to a different volume. But for some reason—perhaps because of a discrepancy in the size of the issues[9]—some other arrangement was devised which, after certain preliminary adjustments, permitted a rotation among the three men, with two always at work on V-VI and one on IV.[10] The two men are identified as 2 and 3 in the first week, 3 and 5 in the second (occasionally assisted by 2), 2 and 5 in the third, 2 and 3 in the fourth, and so on. The one disengaged, and available for other work, is thus recognized as 5, 2, 3, 5, 2, 3, and on, an order which corresponds, with two exceptions (in gatherings P and Y), with that evident in the presswork on the remainder of IV. All work therefore dovetails in the pattern represented by the second table.

[8] Apart from the "lateral" alternation of 5-2-5-2 there is also a "vertical" one in the register of figures in an inner and outer forme within the same assignment. Possibly this indicates, for each man, the inception of work upon the inner forme of a sheet in one volume and the conclusion of work upon the outer forme of a sheet in the other. The work for 5, then, would progress from III Q(i) Q(o) through IV A(i) A(o), and, on his next assignment, from IV D(i) D(o) through III S(i) S(o). Note that the only departure from pattern occurs in the last sheet of each volume (in this phase), where there is also a departure from the order of assignments.

[9] A larger supply of volumes V and VI, first edition, would be required in order to supplement the several editions of the preceding volumes.

[10] Since there is never more than one man casually employed on the IV sequence, there is never more than one figure to each sheet. The two on the other volumes, however, occasionally assist each other.

Table II

Phase 4. Presswork from 10 October through 31 December 1757

Week	Date	Volume IV	Volume V	Volume VI
1	Oct. 10	M8^{v}(o)5	[A-C composed but presswork delayed. Cf. Table III]	A[assigned: unfigured] *B *none or* B6^{r}(i)3 *and/or* B6^{v}(o)2
2	Oct. 17	N8^{v}(o)2	D1^{v}(i)3 D7^{r}(o)2 E4^{v}(o)5 E5^{v}(i)2 F5^{v}(i)5 F8^{v}(o)2	C3^{v}(i)5 D6^{v}(o)3 E6^{r}(i)3
3	Oct. 24	O7^{v}(i)3 †P1^{v}(i)2	*G7^{v}(i)5 H5^{v}(i)2	F2^{v}(o)5 F5^{v}(i)2 G5^{v}(i)5 G6^{v}(o)5
4	Oct. 31	Q4^{v}(o)5	I8^{r}(i)2 *K5^{v}(i)2 *K5^{r}(o)3	H7^{v}(i)3 I3^{v}(i)3
5	Nov. 7	R8^{r}(i)2	L3^{v}(i)3 M1^{v}(i)3	K8^{v}(o)5 L7^{r}(o)5
6-7	Nov. 14-26	S3^{v}(i)3	N1^{v}(i)5 O8^{r}(i)2	M2^{v}(o)2
8	Nov. 28	T8^{r}(i)5	*P8^{v}(o)3 Q6^{r}(i)2	N7^{v}(i)3 N8^{v}(o)2
9	Delay for return of proof for Volume VI, sheet O			
10	Dec. 12	U6^{r}(i)2	*R5^{v}(i)3	O5^{v}(i)5 ‡P7^{v}(i)2 P8^{v}(o)3
11	Dec. 19	X6^{r}(i)3	S5^{r}(o)5 S5^{v}(i)2	Q3^{v}(i)2 Q8^{v}(o)5
12	Dec. 26	†Y5^{v}(i)3	T1^{v}(i)2 U2^{v}(o)2	R5^{v}(i)3 S *none* [3?]

* Figures for sheets so marked vary during course of impression. Except for VI B I have indicated only what I believe to be the first state.

† The two signatures identified represent departures from the 5-2-3 pattern.

‡ The return of 2 marks the only deviation from the schedule of rotation among the men at work on V-VI.

II

For the impression of the "A" issue of V and VI, the volumes to which we shall now confine our attention, external evidence provides a revelation of the confusion attending the preparation of an edition. Whatever the original plan, this soon went awry as a consequence of several delays in the correction of the proof which Dodsley had dispatched to the principal contributors. Chief among these procrastinators was William Shenstone, who received his copies of the first three sheets, fifth volume,[11] as early as September 1757, but neglected to return them, despite repeated requests from the publisher, until January of the following year. Then, as the paper illustrates, these sheets were finally processed with the concluding sheet of the fifth volume and the last three sheets of the sixth. With this group segregated and set aside for later comment, we may now proceed with an account of the remaining signatures, as specified by the figures cited in Table II.

Printing began, I conjecture, about the 10th of October, several weeks after the copy had been sent to Shenstone and shortly after the more conscientious contributors had returned the proofs for VI A-B. At first, it would seem, the work was rather desultory, requiring at the outset (VI A) the services of only one man, who did not figure, and later (VI B) incidental efforts from two, both of whom then figured to distinguish their work. In the second week, apparently, the three men now on the job experienced some difficulty in keeping up with the compositors. To remove the accumulation of formes two of the men therefore simultaneously machined D and E of the fifth volume, and, in the next week, F and G of the sixth. Thereafter, with few excep-

[11] In the fifth volume Shenstone's poems cover only sheets A-C, only three are differentiated in the paper, only three are identified in later correspondence; yet Dodsley, in his letter of transmittal, mentions that four had been struck off. Ralph Straus, *Robert Dodsley; Poet, Publisher & Playwright* (London, John Lane, 1910), p. 137. Possibly the fourth represents the work of another poet for whom Shenstone had assumed the office of editor.

tions, the work proceeded in an orderly fashion, with numbers 3 and 5 averaging four or five formes a week on the V-VI sequence, and number 2 about three. Thus the issue for this edition, like that for the "B" reprint, was 3000 copies.

Since, in any given time, 2 averages no more than three formes a week, and 5 no less than four, some explanation is required for a reversal in the performance of each during the sixth period. Very likely, if their previous record is any criterion, the work of the less efficient man here extends beyond a week and that of the others—5 in this period, 3 in the next—represents only occasional assistance. This would indicate a deliberate slow-down; and that, I believe, is what has occurred, for at VI signature O the printer was again awaiting proof from Shenstone. As proof was not forthcoming, however, he eventually decided to print the uncorrected formes,[12] and then hurried his men along with the others until, on the last day of the year, they had entirely finished with IV and completed the last of the sheets for signature U in V and S in VI.

Now that the occasional work on IV had been brought to a conclusion, the overseer was able to prearrange that for the remaining sheets of V-VI. Hence, as we might expect, the figures are dropped in this, the fifth phase of operations, to be replaced, however, with evidence of another sort. The last seven signatures of V-VI were machined during a period when a depletion in the stock of paper used prior to this time—paper with turned chainlines running, in octavo format, horizontally across the page[13]—necessitated an intermixture with the ordinary variety.

[12] It is to this signature, apparently, that Shenstone refers, first in a letter to Dodsley (21 December 1757) to the effect that "another Sheet is gone to the Press" without his intervention, and later in one to Richard Graves (30 May 1758) where he observes that the improved copy for his verses in the sixth volume (occupying pages $O2^{r}$-$O4^{v}$) "arrived a good deal too late" for correction. Marjorie Williams (ed.), *The Letters of William Shenstone* (Oxford, B. Blackwell, 1939), pp. 475-77, 482.

[13] Messrs. K. Povey and I. J. C. Foster have demonstrated that, with few exceptions, these are sheets of normal size with longitudinal lines (before folding) and not, as had been formerly supposed, half-sheets of double-sized paper. *The Library*,

When the original supply began to run out this other paper was introduced in ever-increasing proportions which serve to distinguish the three separate operations reported in Table III: the

Table III

Phase 5. Presswork from 2 January through 18 February 1758

Week	Date	Copy* / Location	1 ICU	2 TxU	3 HWL	4 HWL	5 NNC	6 CtY	7 JLC	8 NcD	9 MH	10 MH
13	Jan. 2	Unfigured. Paper ratio, 70% horizontal, 30% vertical.										
		VI T	H	H	H	H	H	V	V	V	H	H
		VI U	H	H	H	V	V	H	H	H	V	H
		V B	H	H	H	H	H	V	V	H	H	V
14-15	Delay of two weeks											
16	Jan. 23	Unfigured. 50% horizontal, 50% vertical.										
		VI X	V	V	V	H	V	H	H	H	V	H
		V X	H	V	V	H	H	H	V	V	V	H
17	Delay of one week											
18	Feb. 6	Unfigured, 1st printing. Paper vertical.										
		V A	V	V	V							
		V C	V	V	V							
19	Feb. 13	Figured, 2d printing. Paper vertical [2 figured outer forme of both sheets]								Mixed sheets [only 1 figure]		
		V A				fV	fV	fV	fV	fV	fV	V
		V C				fV	fV	fV	fV	V	V	fV
		[Final print: Vπ^2; VIπ^2 and cancels A3, P1]										

first including signature B of the fifth volume, along with T and U of the sixth, all machined on a mixture of 70% horizontal and 30% vertical paper; the second involving the final signature X of each volume, both impressed on an equal mixture of both varieties; and the third representing the long overdue A and C of the fifth volume, produced at a time when the vertical stock had completely replaced the other. With these facts in mind we return to the chronology of the remaining signatures.

5th ser., V (1950), 184-200. In the reprint of Volumes V and VI, already described, this paper is again used throughout, except for a few sheets of the other which occasionally appear (as in the NcU copy) in the final signature of the fifth volume. Once again the original allotment did not suffice.

* Copies 3 and 4, Herman W. Liebert; copy 7, James L. Clifford.

Toward the end of December, as the correspondence attests,[14] Dodsley managed to recover sheet V B, one of the several proofs Shenstone had been withholding, and forwarded this revised version to Hugh's office, where, in the first week of the new year, the type was then corrected and the formes laid on press, together with those for VI T and U. After this material had been cleared away there was another exasperating delay while Dodsley once again tried to extract the proof for V A and C from his reluctant contributor. Until this was forthcoming the printer could not go on with X, for the latter contained an index subject to change in view of anticipated substitutions in sheet C. When C, with the substitutions, was eventually returned on Saturday, January 21,[15] the necessary alterations in the index were promptly made and, we may suppose, the X formes for both volumes sent to press the following Monday. Ten days later, on February 2, Dodsley notified Shenstone that the final corrections had been entered for A and C.[16] The printing of these formes was therefore underway about February 6, and soon followed, presumably, by several cancels and the preliminary fold [2]for both volumes.

Just when the printing was concluded, however, is another matter. From the evidence given in Table III it would appear that a certain portion of the issue (represented by copies 1-3) was rushed through the press ahead of the remainder. This portion is remarkably uniform, consisting of horizontally lined paper in the first operation, vertically lined paper in the second (with the exception of one sheet in one copy), and unfigured sheets in the third. The remainder, on the other hand, is mixed throughout in the first two sections and figured in the third. Perhaps the distinction marks an intentional underprinting of 1000

[14] Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 475-77.

[15] Straus, *op. cit.*, p. 148. Dodsley's earnest "Pray send the *Rural Elegance*, & let me finish" indicates that A was still reserved.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

copies[17] to expedite the issuance of these at the earliest practicable date.[18] Then, as time allowed, the remaining 2000 copies were processed, and partially figured to differentiate this lot from the other. Whatever the procedure, this "disagreeable business," as Dodsley put it, had in one way or another finally come to an end. In all, to recapitulate, the presswork had by then advanced through the five phases represented, along with the sixth, in this summary form:

Time	Before 10 October 1757			Through 18 February 1878		Later
Phase	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Pressmen	??	2,3	2,5	2,3,5	?? (later, 2)	1,2,3,4
Volumes	I A—X II A—X	III A—P	III Q—Y IV A—L	IV M—Y V D—U VI A—S	V A—C,X VI T—X	"B" I A—X "B" II A—X

The bibliographer may very well reëcho Dodsley's comment on his own publication, for the account of it enforces certain disagreeable considerations which, if they hold for this, may have application elsewhere. One is that in instances of concurrent printing the bibliographer must examine all the books so related before attempting the analysis of any. To do less than this, as our experience with phase 2 has shown, is to learn little or nothing at all. The second is that whenever books contain press figures their very presence implies unsystematic piecework engaged in conjunction with other miscellaneous endeavors. For labor which is predetermined, controlled, and properly recorded by the overseer—as in phases 1 and 5—the figures become superfluous

[17] For another probable instance of underprinting see my description of edition "B2" in "The Bibliographical History of Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*," in: *The Library*, 5th Ser., VI (1951), 100-108.

[18] The two volumes were privately distributed on Monday, March 13 (Straus, *op. cit.*, p. 149), and announced five days later, in the *Daily Advertiser*, as published.

and accordingly disappear. Thus as a preliminary to a solution for the problem at hand the figures serve, first, to introduce us to the complexities of many others beyond our present concern.

All of this reaffirms my earlier conviction that while the figures are indeed a useful tool, their application may at times involve an effort far exceeding the importance of the investigation. Moreover, as the eighteenth-century bibliographer will realize, even if he has the time and patience to put forth this effort, he may soon reach an impasse; for, unlike his more favored colleagues, with their short-title catalogues, indexes, and colophons, he has no convenient register of what has been printed, when and where. He may then admit that, ideally, one should look at other books, but he may also be excused for occasionally declining to perform the impossible.

Bibliographical Notes

Notes on Some Obscure Landor Editions

When Wise and Wheeler published their *Bibliography of Landor* in 1919, they knew of Landor's *Epistola ad Romanos* (their No. 37), a single leaf of Latin prose dated at Bath on May 14, [1849]. Two years later Stephen Wheeler announced the discovery of two companion leaves, *Epistola ad Pium IX. Pontificem* and *Carmen ad Heroinam.*[1] There were in fact at least five such Latin leaflets, and since Landor's immediate concern with their printing and distribution can now be established, there is reason to describe them more fully and to put all five in their places in the sequence of Landor's publications.

The political upheavals in Europe in 1848 broke out just before Landor's seventy-third birthday. He had recently published collected editions of his writings in English and Latin, had translated into English some of the best of the latter, and then, with the resolution to write no more, composed himself in Bath for a peaceful old age and the death which he was ready to accept when it came. Nevertheless, the Englishman who gloried in the fact that the year of his birth marked also the beginning of the American Revolution, who wrote vigorously in praise of the first French Revolution even while his country was at war with the revolutionary government, and who supported both the Neapolitan uprising of 1820 and the Greek war of independence a few years later, was still capable of indignation against reaction and oppression wherever they might be. When news from Florence late in November, 1847, drew his attention to the repressive Austrian decrees in Italy, he ordered "a good handsome sabre and a brace of pistols to be sent forthwith" to each of his sons in Florence, with instructions to run boldly through the body any Austrian who dared to enter their villa.

Then one nation after another in 1848 moved to throw off its yoke of tyranny, and the apparent fulfillment of his youthful hopes stirred Landor's pen once more. First Sicily, then northern Italy broke into revolt. In language that was no weak imitation of Milton's glorious voice Landor

[1] *TLS*, September 22, 1921, p. 612.

composed first an "Ode to Sicily," then "To Saint Charles Borromeo, on the Massacre at Milan," and (before he was done) five other poems calling the Italians to arms. Under the supervision of his friend John Forster, all seven poems were printed in London as a little pamphlet called *The Italics* (W. & W. No. 36), which proclaimed in its Preface, "A bitter schoolmaster is now abroad, and domineering over the indignant manhood of nations, who teaches, not intending it, that above the highest virtues, above the most glorious actions, is tyrannicide."

Only eight days after this pamphlet appeared on February 16, the government of Louis Philippe collapsed before a revolution in France, and Lamartine (whom Landor had known in Florence some years before) took the lead in forming a new French Republic. Landor immediately addressed an ode in Latin alcaics to Lamartine, and ordered it printed.[2] On April 24 he sent Forster a translation for publication in the *Examiner*, and composed a little prefatory note in order to save the credit of that newspaper: "We do not fear that our readers, much as they may admire [this Ode], will catch the spirit of republicanism that it breathes." The translation has taken its place in later editions of Landor's poetry, but the Latin version has not been reprinted.

Next came news of the revolution in Hungary, and on April 10 Landor wrote a letter of warning to the Liberals of that country that Russia was moving to take advantage of the confusion in Poland and central Europe. It was published in the *Examiner* five days later.

About the end of May Forster made the arrangements for yet another political pamphlet, the *Imaginary Conversation of King Carlo-Alberto and the Duchess Belgioioso, on The Affairs and Prospects of Italy*, printed by Meyler and Son in Bath and published by Longmans in London for one shilling, the profits dedicated to the relief of the sufferers in the Sicilian revolt at Messina (W. & W. No. 35). The Duchess, who personally participated in the Lombard uprisings, was the "Heroine" to whom Landor addressed the second of his separately printed Latin alcaic odes, *Carmen ad Heroinam*,[3] a poem which, said Forster, was "[impetuously] scrawled

[2] *Savagius Landor Lamartino*. Seven four-line stanzas in Latin, printed on one side of an octavo leaf that measures $8\frac{5}{8}$ x $5\frac{11}{16}$ inches. There is no date or imprint, but the probability is that this and the four other Latin leaflets here described were printed by Meyler and Son, Bath. This item has not been recorded in the Landor bibliographies, but there is a copy in the Berg Collection.

[3] T. J. Wise, *A Landor Library* (London, 1928), pp. 57-58, with facsimile. The poem was reprinted in Landor's *Hellenics* (1859), and an English version appeared in his *Last Fruit* (1853).

with pencil in the dark in the middle of the night, and in that condition sent to me." One copy of the printed leaf carries the correction of a misprint in Landor's hand.

Landor hailed the election of Prince Louis Napoleon to the Presidency of France in December, 1848, with friendly exhortations that concealed grave doubts. "I wrote a short letter to the President, and not of congratulation," he told Lady Blessington. "May he find many friends as disinterested and sincere." It was not entirely with surprise, therefore, that Landor watched the French troops land at Civitavecchia in the spring of 1849, march against the Roman insurgents under Garibaldi, recapture the Holy City and restore to his temporal powers Pope Pius IX, who had been driven out of his state by the republicans. "Behold the first public act, beyond [France's] boundaries, of its President!" wrote Landor. Before the city fell, he published a leaf of advice to its leaders in Latin prose, *Epistola ad Romanos* (W. & W. No. 37), dated from Bath on May 14, and another abusing the Pope for abandoning his city to the barbarous Gauls, *Epistola ad Pium IX. Pontificem.* The two leaflets are identical in size and appearance, and are presumably of about the same date.[4] They and the *Carmen ad Heroinam* are alluded to in a hitherto unpublished letter from Landor to an unknown correspondent:

Bath. 3 Rivers St.[5]

My dear Sir,

I did send you the alcaics, and without a note, because a note might appear to require an acknowledgment. Here is an Epistle to the Pope and another to the Romans.

The Heroine of the Ode is the Princess Belgioioso, the handsomest woman and the most intellectual in Italy. Here is a poor translation of the latin.

Believe me
My dear Sir
Yours sincerely
W S Landor

The liberal cause in Italy was lost with the fall of Rome to the French on the last day of June, 1849, but the revolutionary movement in Hungary showed strength and promise. The fifth of Landor's curious Latin leaflets was a triumphant alcaic ode of six stanzas addressed to two leaders of that country, *Ad Cossuthum et Bemum,* accompanied by two stanzas

[4] *Epistola ad Pium IX. Pontificem* was reprinted by Stephen Wheeler in *TLS, loc. cit.*; *Epistola ad Romanos* has not been reprinted. The Houghton Library of Harvard University has a copy of each.

[5] Landor moved to this address late in March, 1849.

in English, "To Lord Dudley C. Stuart, with the Above."[6] Russian arms put down the Hungarian revolution in mid-August, but Kossuth remained perhaps the chief of Landor's political heroes.

There is another leaflet attributed to Landor about which it is necessary to remark. Because Orsini's plot to assassinate Napoleon III early in 1858 was hatched in England, the French press became quite abusive of the British, and when the officers and men of the 82nd Regiment of Infantry offered to lead an invasion of England to root out the assassins from "the recesses of their den," the British in their turn were roused to indignation. On March 17, 1858, the *Daily News* printed an anonymous poem of eighteen lines called "A Reply from the Den." Some years later, this poem was reprinted on a single leaf 8¼ x 5⅛ inches, with a prefatory note attributing the lines to Landor, though their appearance in the *Daily News* was misdated March 15. Since three copies of this leaflet were sold with other properties of the radical printer George Jacob Holyoake on June 7, 1928, at Hodgson's, it seems likely that he was responsible for the printing.[7] The tone of the prefatory note indicates clearly enough that Landor had nothing to do with the leaflet, and what is of greater importance, there was nothing in the *Daily News* to connect the poem itself with Landor. If one may judge by its style, it was not his at all.[8]

Two other notes about Landor rarities may be added. Professor R. C. Bald recently learned that Willard Fiske's copy of *Sponsalia Polyxenae* (1819) was in the National Library of Iceland, and described it in *The Library*,[9] but since he was working from a photostatic copy he was able to give neither the nature of the gathering (a half sheet duodecimo) nor the size of the page (8 9/16 x 6 3/16 inches). The Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence has two copies, one of them unbound and held together with two straight pins in the back-fold, just as it left the printer's shop.

In his *Landor Library* (pp. 10-12) Wise described two issues of the quarto *Poems from the Arabic and Persian* (1800), one of them consisting of [vi] + 14 pages and carrying the name of Messrs. Rivingtons as Lon-

[6] Both poems are printed on the same side of a single leaf of blue paper that measures 8⅜ x 5⅜ inches. There is a copy in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence; it has not hitherto been described. The Latin ode was reprinted in *Dry Sticks* (1858), and the lines to Stuart appeared in *Last Fruit* (1853), in the company of another, somewhat later, ode to Kossuth in English.

[7] Cf. *TLS*, June 21, 1928, p. 472.

[8] Wise and Wheeler attributed the poem to Landor in their *Bibliography*, p. 294, but Wheeler did not print it in his subsequent edition of Landor's complete poetical works.

[9] Fifth series, IV (December 1949), 211-212.

don agents, the other consisting of [vi] + 17 pages, and with a blank space on the title-page where the name of the London agents should have been. The three additional pages contained a so-called "Extract from the French Preface," a short essay of Landor's own composition that praised Napoleon for his interest in the cultures of the peoples he conquered. The reasoning by which Wise attempted to establish the much commoner issue *without* the French Preface as the "first issue" is unconvincing, and his conclusion can be refuted by observation of the manner in which the two issues were gathered.[10] The longer pamphlet is made up of six half-sheets of four pages each, beginning with the (unsigned) title-page. Signature D (pp. 13-16) contains the last leaf of poetry and the first leaf of the French Preface. The final gathering, unsigned, contains the conclusion of the French Preface and, conjugate with it, the half-title. When the French Preface was cancelled, the half-title was pasted before the title-page, and leaf D-1 was pasted to leaf C-2. There can be no doubt of the priority of the issue with the French Preface; the London agent could be found only after this objectionable statement had been removed, and the case is exactly parallel to the two issues of *Poetry by The Author of Gebir* printed in the same year (W. & W. No. 7).

R. H. Super

University of Michigan

Unauthorized Readings in the First Edition of Thomson's "Coriolanus"

On the 31st of March 1747 James Thomson wrote from Kew Lane to advise his countryman, David Mallet, that the winter months had not been entirely uneventful. "When the good genius of the season delivers you from the demon of the town I will desire you as a friend to read 'Coriolanus.' Tho' pretty much indifferent whether ever he appear upon the stage or no, yet I am far from being so with regard to his having your approbation."[1] What Thomson had prepared, supposedly, was a

[10] Inasmuch as Wise's copy of the issue *with* the French Preface was bound, it is understandable that he blundered in his description of it as being made up of "signatures . . . A to C (three half-sheets, each 2 leaves), and D (3 leaves), the whole preceded by three unsigned leaves carrying the Half-title, Title-page, and Preface respectively." The more accurate description given above is based on my own copy, unbound and stitched as issued.

[1] From letter reprinted by Peter Cunningham in *Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society*, IV (1857-8), 42.

crabbed script which, like others in earlier years, was then transcribed by William Paterson, his amanuensis, into the numerous fair copies distributed among interested friends. But the author, as he had said, was unconcerned about the fortune of his latest work and finally succumbed, on August 27 of the following year, with the text still unproduced and unpublished.

In this exigency it devolved upon Lord Lyttelton and the Reverend Mr. Mitchell, his literary executors, to arrange for a proper representation. "By their united interest," a contemporary biographer reports, "the orphan play of *Coriolanus* was brought on the stage to the best advantage; from the profits of which, and the sale of manuscripts, and other effects, all demands were duly satisfied, and a handsome sum remitted to his sisters. My Lord *Lyttelton's* prologue to this piece was admired as one of the best that had ever been *written:* the best *spoken* it certainly was. The sympathizing audience saw that, *then* indeed, Mr. *Quin* was *no actor;* that the tears he shed, were those of real friendship and grief."[2] Not the least affecting of Lyttelton's many encomiums was the one which reminded Quin and the audience that the author had left *Not one immoral, one corrupted Thought, / One Line, which dying he could wish to blot.*

The writer neglected to add, however, that there might be other reasons for blotting and transforming a good many lines, certain indefinable reasons known only to himself. The evidence of arbitrary redaction has already been traced in the 1750 edition of the *Seasons* where, in the belief that he was acting "conformably to the intention and will of the author,"[3] Lyttelton silently introduced the first of numerous contemplated alterations. That the others never appeared is a debt we owe to Patrick Murdoch, Thomson's first biographer and a later editor of his works. For Murdoch the only authentic text was not that which Lyttelton had issued in 1750, even less the concoction which he had projected for 1758, but the one which represented the author's final version.[4] What Murdoch and his successors failed to realize, though, was that the hand of the redactor had been busy with other works even before 1750, and that, ac-

[2] Patrick Murdoch, "An account of the Life and Writings of Mr. James Thomson," in his edition of the *Works* (1762), I, xv-xvi.

[3] From a manuscript preface to Lyttelton's intended 1758 edition, as cited in *Thomson's Seasons,* ed. Otto Zippel (Berlin, 1908), p. vii. This edition was suppressed at Murdoch's insistence.

[4] Murdoch's 1762 edition follows the 1746 text except for "Spring," which, for some reason, apparently derives from the 1744 version.

cordingly, portions of the text in his and subsequent editions occasionally reflect changes made a few months after Thomson's death.

Several instances of this alteration may be recognized in the first issue of *Coriolanus*, published under the sponsorship of Lyttelton on 20 January 1749, a week after the initial performance at Covent Garden. It has not been previously noticed that the issue exists in two variants, readily identified by the catchwords on certain pages in gatherings D and E and by the number of lines on the final page of text.

	Page 40	*56*	*58*	*59*	*60*	*61*	*62, text*
A	To	I	Of	Corio-	Punish'd	Whatever	10 lines
B	And	From	Full	Vo-	Gale-	These,	8 lines

Since the press-figures for these gatherings remain constant, denoting a single impression, the extensive rearrangement of type must be regarded as a variant state.[5] So defined, the variation persists throughout, in the copies I have examined, indicating that some of the sheets were completely printed and perfected on the type as originally imposed before presswork was resumed on the remainder. Such a procedure, as the corrector evidently realized, would insure a continuous text in one state or the other.

Of the two the earlier state is determined by its relative infrequency among the extant copies, by the presence of unbroken type-matter, and more particularly by its agreement with the readings in the fair copy which Paterson had prepared for the licenser.[6] After the type had been set according to another copy, presumably from the same hand, and a number of sheets wrought off this imposition, Lyttelton appeared with his revisions. These may best be represented by a collateral citation:

[5] The only deviation among the figures appears in the inner forme of B, where a 3 is registered in some copies at 3^{v}, in others at 6^{r}. Though this shift generally corresponds to the revisions in the later gatherings, the association is, I believe, only accidental. Perhaps the movement of the figure indicates nothing more than an interruption in the printing of the sheets on this forme.

[6] Larpent MS 74. For information concerning this draft I am indebted to Mr. D. F. Bogardus of the Huntington Library.

State "A"

Page 41

TULLUS.

Was it to Them, or Me, you hither came
[16 lines, uninterrupted]
Which, thank my Folly! now is shar'd
betwixt us.

CORIOLANUS.

Immortal Gods! Hear I these Words from
TULLUS!
I will be calm. . . .

Pages 56-57

TULLUS.

Be patient—Hear! By hospitable *Jove!*
I mean thee well—Yes, one last Bounty
more
I frankly will bestow. I have already
From *Rome* protected thee. . . .

Pages 58-59

TULLUS.

For the last time,
Hear me, and mark my Words; the sober
Dictates
Of well-weigh'd Resolution. Thou and I
Are in that State for which resistless
Nature
Has form'd us, Foes again—Begone—
Return—
To head the *Roman* Troops. . . .

State "B"

TULLUS.

Was it to Them, or Me, you hither came
[7 lines, interrupted in the next]
O ill-plac'd Confidence!—

CORIOLANUS.

Immortal Gods!
Hear I these Words from TULLUS!

TULLUS.

What for all this
[remaining 8 lines]
Which, thank my Folly! now is shar'd
betwixt us.

CORIOLANUS.

O Indignation!—Down thou swelling
Heart—
I will be calm. . . .

TULLUS.

Be patient—Hear me speak—I have
already
From *Rome* protected thee. . . .

TULLUS.

Begone—Return—
To head the *Roman* Troops. . . .

All of these, it will be noted, are inconsequential,[7] involving, in one place, the division of a long speech and the insertion of a new line; in another, the addition of a phrase and the deletion of one full and two half-lines; and in a third, the further deletion of two full and two half-lines. Yet, however trivial, the alterations required the transposition of three lines from page 41 to the preceding page in order to accommodate the division and insertion, and, in the next gathering, the forward displacement of all the type from pages 56 through 62 to close the gaps created by the excisions.

As arranged, some copies of the later state were bound up with the remainders of other publications, prefixed with a general title page identifying the book as the third volume of Thomson's works, and issued simultaneously with the separate issue of both states on January 20. In this convenient form the collection was easily accessible to Murdoch, who, we may infer, thereupon selected it as his copy for the 1762 edition and thus unwittingly reproduced a debased text of the kind which in other instances he had summarily rejected.

William B. Todd

Salem College

Edward Bocquet's Illustrated Edition of the "Letters of Junius"

In 1811 the historical engraver Edward Bocquet was invited by Sherwood, Neely & Jones of Paternoster Row to illustrate an edition of the letters of Junius. Bocquet engraved twelve portraits for the edition. These included portraits of Chatham from Brompton, Rockingham from Reynolds, Draper from Gainsborough, Grafton from Hoppner, Blackstone from Gainsborough, George III from Ramsay, North from Dance, Bute from Ramsay, Tooke from a bust, Wilkes from Pine, Mansfield from Reynolds, and Camden from Reynolds. The edition, itself, was an exact reprint of the first authorized edition of the letters printed by Henry Sampson Woodfall in 1772. Lowndes called this "an elegant edition," and listed its publication dates as 1812 and 1813.[1] However, as early as No-

[7] If there is any reason for the emendation and all the trouble that ensued for the printer, it could only be that, in Lyttelton's opinion, Tullus talked too much.

[1] Junius, *Stat Nominis Umbra*. Illustrated by Mr. Edward Bocquet . . . from original paintings. London, Printed by S. McDowall, Leadenhall Street for Sherwood, Neely & Jones, 1812. pp. 1-364. 4to.

In 1813 it was printed again for Gale, Curtis, & Fenner. Lowndes calls Bocquet "Howard Bocquet," but this is an error. Both editions are in the British Museum.

vember 1811, Sherwood, Neely & Jones began to issue the edition in parts, and it was completed in twelve sections. Each part was embellished with a portrait. Parts I and II are respectively dated November 1, 1811, and October 1, 1811 (odd as it may seem); the remaining parts are without dates. The parts are in green wrappers (except Part VI which is in blue), and the titles on each wrapper are enclosed in an ornamental line border. There are no inside titles. The parts are paged continuously (1-364) and are in 4to.[2]

Since the title of the parts is different from that of the collected editions, it may be well to reproduce it:

Mr. E. Bocquet's | Edition of | Junius | illustrated | With portraits of the eminent Characters | mentioned in the letters | Engraved from acknowledged Resemblances | by the first masters | in the possession of Noblemen who have honoured him with Permission | to copy them | Published for the proprietor | By Sherwood, Neely and Jones, Paternoster Row | Printed by S. M'Dowall, Leadenhall Street.

On each of the titles, immediately following the part number, is the legend, "Price Two Shillings and Sixpence."

Francesco Cordasco

Long Island University

Edmund Gosse and the "Sonnets from the Portuguese"

The supposed rôle of Edmund Gosse in the Wise forgery of the *Sonnets from the Portuguese* has been thoroughly examined in recent years, notably by Fannie Ratchford in her introduction to *Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn* (New York, Knopf, 1944) and *Review of Reviews* (reprinted from the University of Texas Library's *Chronicle*, v. 1-2). She has argued very convincingly that it is incredible that Gosse did not see or hear of Lilian Whiting's *The Brownings* (1911) in which his romantic version of the publication of the *Sonnets*, which established the forgery of 1847, is flatly denied by Browning's son, Robert Wiedemann Barrett Browning (1849-1912) who quotes a letter from Robert Browning to Peter Bayne to prove his point. Although one does not expect an essayist to be a scholar of the school of Housman, who maintained that a schol-

[2] I am describing an edition of the original parts recently acquired by Long Island University Library. There is no edition of the original parts in the British Museum or in the Clements Library of the University of Michigan, which has an unusually fine collection of Juniana.

ar must read everything pertaining to his subject although most of it be not worth reading for itself, it is certainly an abuse of his license to ignore an important book which contains a correction of a fundamental error. If Gosse saw the book, he obviously chose to ignore it for reasons best, but not solely, known to himself; for in 1914, two years after the death of the younger Browning, we find the tale in an enlarged form in the third edition of his *Critical Kit-Kats*. In 1927 he wrote a letter to J. R. Burton[1] in which he said that he did not know who Lilian Whiting might be, and questioned that the younger Browning had ever made such a statement.

I have in my possession an attractive edition of the *Sonnets* which seems to have escaped the diligence of collectors and bibliographers, and is not recorded in the printed library catalogues.[2] It is of importance in that it supplies some new information which substantiates Miss Ratchford's case.

SONNETS FROM THE
PORTUGUESE ❧ BY
ELIZABETH BAR-
RETT BROWNING ❧

WITH A NOTE

❧

VENICE
S. ROSEN PUBLISHER

1906

[1] *Letters of Wise to Wrenn*, p. 86.

[2] Collation: narrow 8vo, 4 unsigned gatherings of 8 leaves each. [A1] flyleaf, [A2] recto, blank; verso, vignette of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, [A3] half-title: SONNETS FROM THE | PORTUGUESE | [triangular clover-leaf design]; verso, blank, [A4] recto, title-page, as above, verso, blank, [A5] dedication: TO THE | MARCHESA PERUZZI | DE' MEDICI | THIS EDITION | IS | INSCRIBED. | S. R. | [clover leaf], verso blank, [A6] recto to [A7] recto, pp. 11-[13], Note, [A7] verso, vignette of Palazzo Rezzonico-Browning, [A8] recto to [D5] verso, pp. 15-58, text of the *Sonnets*, [D6] recto, vignette: Tomb of E.B.B. in Florence designed by Lord Leighton, verso blank, [D7] flyleaf, [D8] pastedown. Bound in stiff paper wrapper with title, vignette of Palazzo Rezzonico, and imprint in double ruled red border, on front cover. Rosen's address is included here, Piazza S. Marco 40-41. The back cover has what may be a printer's device, with ROSEN - VENICE beneath. Green ties. Title printed on spine. $6\frac{11}{16}$" x $3\frac{15}{16}$".

The economy in make-up, together with the superficial attractiveness in design, clearly indicates the purpose for the publication of this edition.

The "Note" was written by Robert Barrett Browning, and contains the first explicit, printed contradiction of Gosse's fabrication. The immediate supposition is that he had written to Gosse, and, when Gosse did not correct his mistake in the 1902 edition of *Critical Kit-Kats*, he "gladly" and "the more willingly" took the first opportunity of setting the true story forth in print.

When Browning received Lilian Whiting's query some five years later, he had an answer ready to hand, and his letter to her follows the wording of the "Note" quite closely. It is of passing interest to observe that he did not merely refer Miss Whiting to this edition—whether he was being polite, or whether he knew how hard foreign-printed books are to find, we can only guess; that he did not send her a copy may argue that it was out of print by 1910. Since the quotation from Browning's letter differs in some particulars from the letter to Elizabeth Whiting as quoted by Miss Ratchford, it may be well to reprint it here for the purpose of comparison.[3] It is, of course, quite impossible to say which represents the precise wording of Browning's letter to Bayne. The "Note" is printed in full; the quotation itself is printed in red, and is here reproduced *literatim*, including a faulty use of quotation marks.

NOTE

In accordance with a wish of Mr. Rosen, too kindly expressed for me not to comply with it, I gladly proffer an account of the way in which the "Sonnets from the Portuguese" became first known to him to whom they had been addressed; and I do so the more willingly since it differs in essential points from other versions which have been given. To accomplish this in the fewest and best words for the purpose, the following portion may be quoted of a letter, which was written in answer to a friendly inquiry, by Robert Browning on March 10, 1881.

" 'The "Sonnets" were only known to exist and seen for the first time by the person to whom they were addressed, two or three years after the writer's marriage. The reticency came of some misunderstood remark which seemed to

[3] The differences between Browning's "Note" and his letter to Lilian Whiting as given by Miss Ratchford (*Letters of Wise to Wrenn*, p. 85) follow. The Whiting letter begins with line 2 "I gladly proffer"; line 3, first became; lines 3-4, Were addressed. And I do; l. 6, Whiting has "from" for "of"; lines 7-8 in Whiting read, "written by my father in reply to a friendly inquiry dated March 10, 1881"; l. 12, Whiting has a comma after "Fortunately"; l. 14, Whiting has writer of the 'Sonnets'; l. 15, Whiting does not italicize "you?"; l. 16, Whiting omits "the"; l. 16, Whiting has "our" for "her"; l. 17, Whiting has "earnest" for "urgent"; and line 18 does not begin a new paragraph in Whiting.

These errors in transcription are of a very common class, paleographically speaking. No important thought is altered.

doubt the depth and sincerity of such feelings so exhibited in verse. Fortunately some other long subsequent conversation did more justice to an exceptional case, and the next morning the writer said: "Do you know I once wrote some verses to *you?*

"This was at the Bagni di Lucca after the birth of her child a few months before. The poems were only printed at my urgent entreaty.

'I consider that the poor fancy that I might seem too anxious for my own self-glorification, as people would perhaps suppose, ought not to prevail against all that power and beauty—however unworthy the subject they had been bestowed upon."

It may perhaps be mentioned here that the writer of the "Sonnets" was sometimes playfully called by him "his little Portuguese", in connection with her poem " Catarina to Camoens"; whence the title chosen which when they were published afforded a veil, however slight, to conceal the identity of the author.

R. B. B.

Palazzo Rezzonico
Sept. 1. 1905.

The firm of S. Rosen has been reported out of business, and no further details are known about this edition. We can assume that it was not a large edition, and printed with the English colony and tourists in mind, hardly for export. Yet, however small or large the edition may have been, it is surprising that no copy reached collectors in England or America who would have pointed out the discrepancy in the stories, or that none of Gosse's or Forman's or Wise's travelled friends acquired a copy. It requires no vivid imagination to visualize a presentation copy sent to Gosse, perhaps rather maliciously. Be that as it may, this book is the first printed denial of Gosse's romantic myth.

RALPH HAGEDORN

Sun Valley, California

A. E. Housman's Printer's Copy of "Last Poems"

Grant Richards, recalling his first glimpse into the fifty-page manuscript of *Last Poems*, exclaims with an enthusiasm touched with a gleam of omnipathy: "Yes, the greatest moment in my life as a publisher was when I opened the sheaf of manuscript that was *Last Poems*. . . . I will go further and say that no publisher alive has had a greater thrill."[1]

[1] *Housman, 1897-1936* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 195. It is from Grant Richards' gossipy but useful memoir, pp. 191-201, that most of the data in reference to the publication of *Last Poems* has been drawn. The confession quoted above was first made in his *Author Hunting* (London, Hamilton, 1934), p. 267.

This was on the evening of June 20, 1922. Richards' secretary began making a typescript of the poems the following morning. The book itself was published almost exactly four months later, and on November 1 Housman presented his manuscript of *Last Poems* to the Fitzwilliam Museum, at Cambridge. With it he addressed this letter to the Director, his friend Mr. Sydney Cockerell:

Trinity College 1 November 1922
Dear Cockerell:

As I still cannot lay my hands on the *Shropshire Lad* MS., and as you are more ardent for possession than the College Library, I send the MS. of *Last Poems*. Half-a-dozen pieces are missing. The MS., as you will see, did not go to the printers but a typewritten copy was made in the publisher's office.

Yours sincerely,
A. E. Housman

This swift routing of the manuscript from Housman's desk to his publisher's, back to the author, and thence to the Fitzwilliam, with no stopover at the printing-house, was to posterity's advantage; for nearly every one of the forty-five sheet is in near "mint" condition. Unlike the printer's copy of *A Shropshire Lad*, which went where it was intended and received its full due of thumb-smudges, this final draft of *Last Poems* now looks about as it did just after Housman put the last period on the last page. His publisher had suggested that it would be necessary to prepare for the printer a typewritten copy of the manuscript, and to this arrangement Housman had agreed—not without the whimsical protest that "it [the typewriting] will not be more legible than the hand I write literature in." Grant Richards' first look at the manuscript must have caused him to give thanks, however, that his author had yielded the point, for the rotund, easy style of the poet's early hand is not present here. There are several evidences of hasty penmanship that ran off errors that were crudely corrected by penstrokes or overwriting. In many of the pages the script is somewhat cramped or sketchy. No compositor not an expert in Housman's calligraphy could have been safely trusted with it.

All this is not to say that, so far as the *matter* of the pages is concerned, this draft was made with less than the meticulous care the poet habitually gave to such tasks. Thanks to pains taken, the agreement between his copy and the text of the first edition is nearly perfect, even by his standards. There are but nine variations in punctuation—to be painfully exact—between Housman's ms. and the first printing, and none of these are important. There are but four verbal discrepancies (which may be

accounted for by substitutions made later in proofreading), and one of these is a mere inadvertence in spelling *forlorn*. In his preface to *Last Poems* Housman mentions his solicitude for these minutiae in launching his final book of poetry, declaring "What I have written should be printed while I am here to see it through the press and control its spelling and punctuation." If things did not come out right in print, the ones to blame were the "filthy beasts" who "corrected" his copy. And blamed they were, in language as scorching as the epithets Housman the Latinist used to blast the German editors of Manilius.

The pages of the manuscript measure 12¼" x 7¼". They are numbered in the upper right corner, with no numerals above the poems. All the pages are ruled horizontally in light-blue ink and eight have a left-hand marginal rule. Housman wrote throughout in black ink, using a rather coarse pen. There is no Table of Contents in the ms.

In his letter of transmittal to Sydney Cockerell, the poet remarks that half-a-dozen pieces are missing. Actually only five sheets seem to be absent: numbers 5, 14, 19, 21, and 43. Five poems are missing: III, XV, XVII, XVIII, and XXII; and as luck would have it a late but not final draft of one of these poems (no. III) is reproduced opposite page 196 of Grant Richards' memoir. It is certain that the five missing drafts were not, in whole or in part, sent to the British Museum; three *Last Poems* holographs are preserved there, but they are of poems XII, XXXIII, and XXXV.[2] In the notes that follow, something will be said as to the possible identity of these five "lost" poems.

The order of the lyrics in the printed book was a matter of more than secondary importance to the author. On June 15th he takes this problem up with his publisher:

> I cannot arrange the order of the poems satisfactorily until I know for certain which I shall include and which omit; and on that point, as I told you, I want to consult one or two people. Therefore I want the poems printed first simply according to the various metres they are written in, not at all as they will afterwards stand. Will the transposition which will then have to be made before the book arrives at its proper form be very expensive? If so, perhaps type-writing had better be used, but I do not like it, as it makes things look repulsive.

But by the time the copy was ready to send off, Housman was more confident of finality: "I do not think much transposition will be required," he observed in the note that accompanied the complete manuscript on the

[2] These are fair copies, slightly corrected, that Laurence Housman presented to the Keeper of Manuscripts, June 13, 1936, through Professor G. M. Trevelyan.

19th of June. As a matter of fact, the numbering of his pages agrees precisely with the sequence of print as far as page 20 of the ms. which contains the 16th poem. On July 10th, returning corrected proofs, Housman sent in his one additional poem, which was XVII or XVIII (two of the five pieces now missing). With this insertion came directions for some rearrangements, which are specified in my notes that follow. The great thing in the ordering of the pieces of his second volume is the sequence of the concluding three poems, which rise one after the other into a climax of exquisitely tuned music that has no parallel in Housman's poetry and few in others'.

So much for generalities. It is the study of the drafts of the poems themselves that is most interesting, since they allow an over-the-shoulder glimpse of the preparation of the book which had been awaited by readers in Britain and America for over a quarter of a century.

Prologue poem ("We'll to the woods no more"). Line 10—*leavy woods*. This older spelling was abandoned in proofreading, and the first edition has *leafy woods*.

At the right of his draft Housman drew a long enclosing line and wrote "Italics, and smaller print than the rest." Though Richards objected to the smaller type, the first edition showed he followed orders. It is worth noting that the only anterior draft for this poem that has survived in Housman's notebooks (the remains of which are in the Library of Congress) carries the title, "*Nous n'irons plus aux bois*," quoted from a 15th-century *ronde*. Having decided that "We'll to the woods no more" was to be the title poem for the book, Housman must have seen that the poem itself was better left untitled.

I. ("The West"). On pages 2 and 3. Line 8—the period at the end of stanza two was inadvertently omitted in the ms.

II. ("As I gird on for fighting"). On page 4. No variations in print.

III. ("Her strong enchantments failing"). Not in the ms.; probably on the missing fifth sheet. The facsimile opposite page 196 of Richards' memoir, although it is entitled "A Page from the Original Manuscript of *Last Poems*," does not appear to be a representation of the missing sheet, as no ruled lines are to be seen. The Richards facsimile shows line two thus: *Her woven toils in wreck*. The second and third words were line-canceled by the poet, and *towers of fear* written above, bringing the poem to the finality of print. This poem had been intended to be XLIII of *A Shropshire Lad*; it was cancelled in the proofsheets.

IV. ("Illic Jacet"). On page 6. No variations in print.

V. ("Grenadier"). On page 7. Line 8—~~can~~ *shall march*. This substitute word (like others of its kind throughout the ms.) was written in pencil, later retraced in ink.

VI. ("Lancer"). On page 8. Line 9—Housman absently wrote *by lying*, then bearing on his pen, blurred the first word to *be*.

VII. ("In valleys green and still"). On page 9. No variations in print.

VIII. ("Soldier from the wars returning"). On page 10. At the end of line 5 the ms. shows a semicolon; the printed text has a comma. In line 13 a comma omitted after the first *you* was added in proofreading.

IX. ("The chestnut casts his flambeaux"). On page 11. This is the first of the poems about which Housman, comparing his new volume to *A Shropshire Lad*, dropped this warning to his publisher: ". . . it [*Last Poems*] had better have a wider page, or smaller print, or both, as there are more poems in it which have long lines." There are no variations between the ms. and print.

X. ("Could man be drunk for ever"). On page 12. No variations in print.

XI. ("Yonder see the morning blink"). On page 13. This poem was once intended to be XXXIV of *A Shropshire Lad*. The withdrawn draft is sheet 146 of the Library of Congress mss. It shows many corrections and alternate readings, indicating that twenty-six years earlier the author had gone to more than usual pains to ready it for his first volume. The *Last Poems* draft shows no variations from print.

The sheet that bore the numeral 14 is the second of the five missing ones. As the next page in order contains the next poem to be printed—no. XII—it seems probable that page 14 of the ms. contained a poem which Housman decided later to take out. It may be said here by way of parenthesis that the "lost" pieces of the *Last Poem* manuscripts may be accounted for within some shadow of a doubt by examining the pages of Housman's fourth and final notebook, from which a large portion of *Last Poems* was copied. Here, it is evident that after making printer's copy he habitually overscored his notebook draft with a long perpendicular or diagonal line. Three poems in Notebook D show this sign: "The stars have not dealt me" (page 48), "Easter Hymn" (page 64), and "Stone, steel, dominions pass" (page 66).[3] The Library of Congress mss. include a draft of "Easter Hymn," made very likely for inclusion in the *Last Poems* copy. The volume now containing it also includes seven other pieces of similar appearance: drafts on foolscap, written in the style of those that went to Richards. Thus it seems that Housman at one time was considering at least ten more pieces than were published. All of these rejections appeared in the two posthumous collections: *More Poems* (1936) and *Additional Poems* in Laurence Housman's *A.E.H.* (1937).

[3] These three lyrics were published, respectively, as XVII of *Additional Poems* and I and XXIV of *More Poems*. It should be noted that the rejections of each of Housman's volumes went into the copy of a successor. Although nearly two-thirds of the 654 pages of his four notebooks have perished, it is not likely that much if any of his worthwhile poetry has been lost. Eventually the remains of the verse passed over by his brother, Laurence Housman, will be edited by the author of this article and published by the Syracuse University Press.

XII. ("The laws of God, the laws of man"). On page 15. No variations in print.

XIII. ("The Deserter"). On pages 16 and 17. No variations in print.

XIV. ("The Culprit"). On page 18. No variations in print.

XV. ("Eight O'Clock"). Not in the ms.; probably on page 19, also missing here.

XVI. ("Spring Morning"). On page 20. No variations in print.

XVII. ("Astronomy"); XVIII. ("The rain, it streams on stone and hillock"). The drafts of these two poems are not in the ms. One or the other of them may have occupied page 21, which likewise is absent. Either XVII or XVIII was the one addition Housman sent to his publisher after delivering the packet of final drafts. Both of these poems commemorate the death of the poet's younger brother, George Herbert; and it may have been that Housman decided only at the eleventh hour to return to this theme, already touched in "Illic Jacet"—number IV.

XIX. ("In midnights of November"). On page 22. Line 18—instead of *forlorn* Housman absently wrote *folorn*.

XX. ("The night is freezing fast"). On page 23. No variations in print.

XXI. ("The fairies break their dances"). On page 30. The forward shift of this poem was evidently one of the few rearrangements the poet asked for in a letter dated July 10th, accompanying the corrected proof sheets.

XXII. ("The sloe was lost in flower"). There is no draft for this number; it may have been on the missing 43rd page.

XXIII. ("In the morning, in the morning"). On page 24. This poem was the last of the three pieces once intended for *A Shropshire Lad* but later withdrawn; the rejected draft (headed XXVIII) is now sheet 136 of the Library of Congress mss. Only one line there (no. 5) shows a variation from the draft made for *Last Poems*, which passed into print exactly as we now read it.

XXIV. ("Epithalamium"). On pages 25 and 26. No variations in print.

XXV. ("The Oracles"). On page 29. This poem was moved out of its original position, which was two places nearer the end. The first three lines of the last stanza the poet underlined, indicating italic type. The title "The Oracles" must have been the result of a last-minute decision, for the ms. shows no heading; the title "The Oracle" appeared over the poem when it was published in the 1903 *Venture* (page 39), an annual edited by Laurence Housman and Somerset Maugham and published by John Bailie. The poem was probably copied from page 202 of Notebook B, but there the title of the piece is "Delphi and Thermopylae." This is another of the long-line poems, and Housman's draft of it shows no broken lines, the longest ones ending neatly near the right margin —an encouragement to the printer to follow copy, which he did not do.

XXVI. ("The half-moon westers low"). On page 27. No variations in print.

XXVII. ("The sigh that heaves the grasses"). On page 28. No variations in print.

XXVIII. ("Now dreary dawns the eastern light"). On page 32. This poem and the one following changed places in going from draft to print.

XXIX. ("Wake not for the world-heard thunder"). On page 31. No variations in print.

XXX. ("Sinner's Rue"). On page 33. Line 7—*the ~~flower~~ weed.* Line 13 *healing*
—of ~~staining~~. Above this poem Housman wrote a title from Heine, *Die Armesuenderblume,* then crossed it out with a heavy pen and superscribed *Sinner's rue.*

XXXI. ("Hell Gate"). On pages 34, 35, 36, and 37. The only correction in the draft of this, Housman's longest poem, occurs in line 68, where he canceled *swarm* and wrote above it *hive.*

XXXII. ("When I would muse in boyhood"). On page 38. Line 2—the comma at the end of the line in the Richards edition does not occur in the ms.

XXXIII. ("When the eye of day is shut"). On page 39. Lines 1, 2—At the ends of these lines there are no commas as in the printed text. Line 3,—*the hunter's hut.* The ms. shows no alternate; and it must have been in the proofreading that Housman changed *hunter's* to *forest,* thus departing from the reading he had taken from page 45 of his third notebook, the source for this poem.

XXXIV. ("The First of May"). On page 40. Line 20—*Stands upright on the dead.* This was the first reading, but Housman line-canceled the second word and superscribed *lofty.* This word evidently passed into the proof sheets, where it later gave way to *planted,* which is probably a reminiscence from a single line written long ago on page 139 of his second notebook: *Planted deep on perished people.* The title seems also to have been added by afterthought, for it is crowded near the upper margin of the manuscript page; all of the other captions in the ms. are written comfortably down on one of the first four lines.

XXXV. ("When first my way to fair I took"). On page 41. No variations in print.

XXXVI. ("Revolution"). On page 42. The title by which readers know the poem is not in Housman's draft; there is none for it in the first edition nor in the five other printings of 1922. The poet named this lyric in a letter to Grant Richards dated 28 January 1926, granting permission to the Headmaster of Winchester College to use the poem in an anthology: ". . . and if he wants a title he can call it 'Revolution,' which may be of use, as most readers do not seem to see that it is a parable."

The next sheet in the manuscript (no. 43) is the last of the missing five. It may have contained a rejected poem, or possibly the missing poem XXII.

XXXVII. ("Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries"). On page 44. No variations in print.

XXXVIII. ("Oh stay at home, my lad"). On page 45. No variations in print.

XXXIX. ("When summer's end is nighing"). On pages 46 and 47. No variations in print.

XL. ("Tell me not here"). On page 48, which was by error also numbered 47. Line 10—*leavy dells*. Here the poet again preferred the archaic spelling of the adjective, as he had in the prologue poem.

XLI. ("Fancy's Knell"). On pages 49 and 50. Lines 2 and 15—the printed commas at the ends of these lines are not in the manuscript; nor is the Shakespearean title. Uniquely here, the individual stanzas were headed by Arabic numerals, later canceled by diagonal pen strokes.

The notebooks of a poet are his personal diary, but printer's copy is a love-letter addressed to fame. A. E. Housman, remembering that another letter similarly addressed by him twenty-six years ago had reached its destination, must have looked upon his draft of *Last Poems* as a kind of postscript. Otherwise he might have had some misgivings about the likelihood of its arrival. Sorting the fifty pages of his copy, he probably was conscious of other faults than the scantiness of this late harvest. He must have had little liking for the three discards refurbished from the printer's copy of *A Shropshire Lad;* for the impious "The laws of God, the laws of man," which had lain among his papers for twenty-eight years; for the longest piece of all, "Hell Gate," which owed so much to the idol of his youth, G. A. Simcox.

It is true that in his notebooks or elsewhere there were a few other gleanings that might have been added to this late in-gathering. Among them was one poem of peculiar beauty, a recollection of old, unhappy, far-off things that would soon be forgotten. Too revealing to be sent forth now, it would later be copied fair on page 118 of the last notebook, only seven pages from the end; but it would be blotted out and left for other eyes to read if they cared and could. This lyric belonged in this manuscript; it would have adorned his first volume. *It* is A. E. Housman's last poem.*

* *The Dalhousie Review* printed the poem in its Autumn, 1951, issue. *Editor.*

Tom Burns Haber

Ohio State University

Book Reviews

Essays Honoring Lawrence C. Wroth. [Device] Portland, Maine, [The Anthoensen Press], 1951. Frontispiece (portrait), facsimiles, tables. xxi, 515 pp. 10 x 7 inches. $25.00.

Twenty-eight years have passed since Lawrence Wroth, then recently appointed as head of The John Carter Brown Library, sat with two colleagues at a dinner in Boston and discussed "plans for coöperative effort to advance the interests of our art and craft." From the ideas that passed across the table, the one to "make our homage to Wilberforce Eames" was at once acted upon. A year later, in 1924, there appeared *Bibliographical Essays. A Tribute to Wilberforce Eames.* Some years afterward Mr. Wroth said that he believed this to be "the earliest American symposium in honor of a bibliographer or a librarian." No caution such as Mr. Wroth's is necessary in saying that the "Eames volume" was the first in the tradition of Mr. Wroth's "art and craft." Through the ensuing years he has come to stand for the best in American librarianship. The appearance of the volume here reviewed points up the fact that almost a generation has passed since that Boston dinner. Of the twenty-eight men and women who contributed in 1924, only two, Clarence Brigham and Henry R. Wagner, are present in this volume; the rest are pupils or disciples of Mr. Wroth's concept of books. Rare books have, in his own words, become books with "a special grace added to esteem." This volume then is a monument not only to the man honored, but to the standards he has striven to set for librarians, scholars and collectors.

Festschrift volumes all too often show the results of a hasty call by an editor, with deadlines too close to allow contributors to write anything worthy of the occasion. Such is not the case here. The "Wroth volume" is a worthy successor to the "Eames volume." Comparisons of essays in a collection such as this are meaningless. Each contributor has set his own task, and the question for the reader is how successful he has been in completing that task. Each essay makes a contribution to the field, some more substantial than others, but the importance of each is determined by the scope of the individual subjects. The volume in general is devoted to

Americana before 1800. Almost all the topics are bookish in nature. Some are strictly bibliographical, while others use books as a point of departure to discuss broader subjects in which "the book" has played an important part. Appropriately, there are three articles devoted to Brown University or The John Carter Brown Library. Since the topics have no unity except the general one, Americana, it seems best to deal briefly with them in the order in which they appear.

Elizabeth Baer's "Richard Eden's Copy of the 1533 *Decades* of Peter Martyr" describes the copy of the book used for the first English translation by Eden. Miss Baer comments on the marginal notes and particularly on Eden's hypothetical maps of some of the islands in the West Indies based entirely on the descriptions in the book. Line cuts of both notes and maps are included. Leicester Bradner's "Columbus in Sixteenth-Century Poetry" is an able addition to our understanding of the impact of the Discovery on the European mind. The author analyzes four poems by Gambara, Stella, Giorgini, and Juan de Castellanos as both literature and history, showing the growth of an idealized Columbus.

Clarence S. Brigham's "American Booksellers' Catalogues, 1734-1800" is based on the collection in The American Antiquarian Society, which has forty-two of the possible fifty-eight titles. A short introduction gives an overall picture of the nature of the collection and its high spots, with an extensive list of the catalogues at the end. There is a full description of each book and an account of its contents that gives such information as the number of entries, subjects and some typical titles.

Lloyd A. Brown's "The River in the Ocean" is the story of the growth of man's knowledge of the Gulf Stream from its first discovery to its first systematic description by Benjamin Franklin and William Gerard De Brahm. These two, working independently, arrived at results that lifted the Gulf Stream from the realm of nautical tradition and made it a part of man's recorded knowledge. Mr. Brown tantalizingly points out that the map of the Gulf Stream made by Franklin, called the Folger-Franklin map, was actually engraved although no copy has ever been located.

Curt F. Bühler's "Novello Cattanio: *Un viaggio fatto alli paesi del continente nuovo*" deftly eliminates that Morgan manuscript as a true account of a voyage to the New World. He proves that instead of being an account of a trip taken by one Cattanio from 1531 to 1533 it is actually a hoax written sometime after 1625 by an unknown person. Frederick R. Goff, Chairman of the Committee on Publication of the book, in his contribution, "The First Decade of the Federal Act for Copyright, 1790-1800,"

describes the first ten years of the operation of that act and analyzes the subject matter of the first books registered by the new nation. Appended is a list of the registrations at the Pennsylvania office, the one to receive the largest number. E. P. Goldschmidt frankly indulges a hobby in his "Not in Harrisse," adding a number of books published between 1496 and 1515 which, he believes, should be in the *Bibliotheca Americana Vetustissima*. Six of these he describes in some detail, quoting to prove his thesis.

Lewis Hanke's "The *Historia de las Indias* of Bartolomé de las Casas" tells of the existing manuscripts of this major work in the history of Spanish America which lay unpublished until 1875. Some missing parts of the original manuscript are probably still to be discovered.

Richard S. Hill's "The Melody of 'The Star Spangled Banner' in the United States before 1820" is an ably documented correction of a point in Oscar Sonneck's 1914 report on our national anthem. The author reasserts a statement made in 1873 by Stephen Salisbury that the tune was not popular in this country until after 1798, and lists a large number of the parodies on "To Anacreon in Heav'n." He points out that there is still much to be learned about the history of our national anthem.

William A. Jackson's "Tunc et Nunc: or the Pepys and Taylor Collection of Early English Books on Navigation" compares the great seventeenth-century collection on the subject with that now owned by Henry Calhoun Taylor of New York. George Kubler's "John Carter Brown and America" is an appreciation of the broad definition of "Americana" used by the library. In particular he thanks the library for its fine Latin-American holdings. Gerald D. McDonald's "William Bradford's Book Trade and John Bowne, Long Island Quaker, as his Book Agent, 1686-1691" uses Bowne's account book (1649-1703), in the New York Public Library, as the point of departure, also describing some of the business practices of Pennsylvania's and New York's first printer. James G. McManaway's "King James Takes a Collection" takes four printed letters of four English bishops, written to accompany Richard Whitbourne's *A Discourse Containing a Louing Inuitation* (1622), and tells of their share in a money-raising scheme. The project was part of a plan to use the Church of England as an agency to raise money for the colony in New Foundland.

William Greene Roelker's "The Browns and Brown University" traces the influence of the Brown family on the University and the rôle played by the family in moving Rhode Island College from Warren, R. I., to Providence in 1770, and in the changing still later of the institution's name.

Carl P. Rollins' "The Bibliographical Press at Yale University" is the story of the rise, fall and resurrection of an attempt to teach Yale graduate students something about hand printing. A check-list of the issues of the press from 1928 to 1950 is appended. Jesse H. Shera's "Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography in America, 1642-1799: An Exploratory Essay" cites only Evans, George L. McKay's *American Book Auction Catalogues 1713-1934*, and Clarence Brigham's article in the present volume. Further work needs to be done on this subject, about which all too little is known. Rollo G. Silver's "The Boston Book Trade, 1790-1799" is an addendum to his *The Boston Book Trade 1800-1825*, a directory of the craft for that city. Henry Stevens' and Roland Tree's "Comparative Cartography" is a series of notes on variants of ninety-three American maps that have passed through the firm. The notes are based on work originally started by Henry N. Stevens which he had hoped to publish as a book. Bradford F. Swan's "The First Printing in Providence" straightens out the question of the dating of the first issue of the first press in that city. He proves that the first imprints must have been made in August of 1762, not in June as has been claimed in the past.

Marie Tremaine's "A Half-Century of Canadian Life and Print, 1751-1800" is a substantial piece of work. In a well-written and well-organized essay she traces the growth of Canadian printing under the stimulation of refugee printers from the American colonies. The sterility of the products of the press is explained in terms of isolated communities and the printers' dependence upon the government for the principal part of their incomes.

R. W. G. Vail's "A Pair of Peripatetic Printers" tells the story of John Holt and Samuel Loudon, two New York printers, who although they thoroughly disliked each other's company, rendered similar services to this country during the Revolution. Both were forced to leave New York with the Continental army, both were able to set up shops elsewhere, and both printed many important documents of the Revolution. Holt, the abler of the two, died in poverty while Loudon prospered. A check-list of the issues of the two presses is included.

Henry R. Wagner's "Hispanic Americana in the John Carter Brown Library" is a history of the early acquisitions of the library in that field, also detailing his part in the collection that passed from him to Herschel V. Jones and ultimately to the John Carter Brown.

Lyle H. Wright's "Eighteenth-Century American Fiction" considers the kind of fiction written by Americans in the early days of the nation,

maintaining that "the lack of originality and the weakness of structure in early fiction in no way detract from the dauntless spirit of its authors." Appended is a check list with critical annotations and short biographies of some, though not all, of the writers.

John Cook Wyllie's "The First Maryland Charter" redates from 1632 to 1685 what has been called the first printing of the charter, thus making it the third printing. He relies upon textual rather than bibliographical evidence, although he himself is convinced by the latter, because of the lack of systematic knowledge of printing of that period.

Here then are a series of essays that settle points, open new avenues of investigation and tell stories that should be told. If a *Festschrift* does all these things it can certainly be called successful.

Thomas R. Adams

University of Pennsylvania

Aus der Welt des Buches. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Georg Leyh. Dargebracht von Freunden und Fachgenossen. 75. Beiheft zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen. Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1950. 287 pp.

On the sixth of June, 1947, Georg Leyh was 70 years old. Friends and colleagues united in honouring him with a *Festschrift,* whose value differs only in externals from the one presented to him in 1937. After three years it has here been translated into print by the combined efforts of the firms who had published and printed the 1937 *Festschrift.* Contributions were made by men from other countries to the earlier volume; these are lacking in the book under discussion but for the single essay on the fateful mardi gras in 1570 upon the castle Waldenburg by Felix Burckhardt, the Zürich scholar and biographer of Hermann Escher. Though there are a dozen or more illustrations including tables, these fall short numerically and physically of those included in the 1937 *Festschrift.* The contents of the latter were organized into eight chapters: Medieval and renaissance books and manuscripts, Book collections, History of libraries, Library administration, Modern printing, Books and life, History of scholarship, and Wirtembergicum, while the 1950 volume has three divisions only: Manuscripts and early printing, History and administration of libraries, and History of scholarship and civilization.

The only subjects treated in 1937 which are not found in the more recent volume are modern printing and philosophy of librarianship, repre-

sented by one essay each in 1937. At least 14 of the 36 contributors to the 1937 *Festschrift* are no longer living today; of the others five appear with papers in the new volume, as well as four of those listed only in the *Tabula Gratulatoria* of 1937. The last group includes Walter Menn, with a valuable essay on the new situation in the Gutenberg tradition following Carl Wehmer's well-founded conversion of the astronomical calendar into an astrological device. Viktor Burr presents a treatise on the relationship of Pliny the Younger to literature and the establishment by him of a library at Como. Heinrich Uhlendahl describes the publisher W. H. Hahn's original contribution in 1848 to a *Reichsbibliothek* at the seat of parliament in Frankfurt, with J. H. Plath as its first librarian, and the fate of the new institution and its final conservation in the Deutsche Bücherei at Leipzig. Finally, Ludwig Klaiber, recounting Leopold Delisle's vigorous and effective administration of the Bibliothèque Nationale, also makes an essential contribution to the history of libraries.

The five *redivivi* include Pater Alban Dold, Paul Lehmann, Albert Predeek, Karl Preisendanz, and Enno Littmann. Predeek, in 1937, treated of Panizzi as Klaiber deals with Delisle; now he discusses librarianship as a full-fledged discipline in the universities. Karl Preisendanz, curator of manuscripts and papyri at Heidelberg, contributes a very readable account of research in the evidence of theory and practice of ancient magic, especially on the Thebes papyrus, probably more than 1500 years old. Most librarians will have found the Latin medievalist Paul Lehmann's discourse on ancient fore-runners of the union catalogue in 1937 more to their taste than his present extensive essay on the library of the Protestant reformer Johannes Hessius. The contribution of Alban Dold, a Benedictine priest from Beuron, on the origin of the Roman letter texts in the Wolfenbüttel Codex Carolinus, and Enno Littmann's study of the Arabic poem of Cat and Mouse will be more appreciated by non-librarians.

The remaining contributions may be accounted for in the order of their appearance in the book. In addition to those by Dold and Menn, there are five essays dealing with the subjects of manuscripts and incunabula. Bernhard Bischoff makes an interesting palaeographical analysis of Codex Sangallensis 878. Pater Bonifaz Fischer of Beuron furnishes a critical study of the texts of Bishop Lucifer of Cagliari. Kurt Hannemann has a most difficult time with a most distracting palimpsest of the transition period from manuscript to print. Ruthardt Oehme has something worthwhile for Covarrubias map fans in his study of the Bernhard von Breidenbachs map of Palestine, resulting from his trip there in 1486. Finally,

Ernst Kyriss presents his Suebian colleague with a fine study of the bindings of Johannes Zoll, a 15th-century book binder of Tübingen, including 64 well-executed reproductions of designs and one full-page reproduction of the front cover of an incunabulum in the Germanic Museum at Nürnberg.

There are also three historical studies on problems of library administration. Hans Widmann contrasts the attitudes of 18th-century university and library administrators and draws parallels with those of contemporary librarians, especially in the matter of centralized and departmental collections. Wieland Schmidt discusses the present situation of the cataloguing of manuscripts in Germany and proposes a detailed index to all existing catalogues in the German-speaking countries. Erwin Ackerknecht's study of city library buildings should be of interest to students of public libraries and adult education. The distinction between *Stadtbücherei, Volksbücherei* and *Einheits-Bücherei,* little understood in Anglo-Saxon countries, is here made clearer.

The remaining contributions to the history of civilization and scholarship are a useful article on the chapter entitled *tosho* (=book) in Fujimura Saku's Dictionary of Literature, with a table of 120 Japanese ideograms representing book-terms and their transposition into Latin characters; a study by Wilhelm Boeck on the relationship of paintings and their designations, which will make many readers perhaps more charitable to modern painting; and Paul Diepgen's interesting report on one of the best collections of medical writings which have come to us out of the days of the early Renaissance: 157 case histories including 20 autopsies recorded by Antonio Benivieni, who died in 1502 at Florence.

Hans Widmann and Viktor Burr, who sign the short address to the honoured professor and librarian, prefacing the book, are to be congratulated on their effort in bringing together such a valuable array of scholarly contributions. The impressive list of Leyh's writings since 1937, adding six pages to the fourteen of the 1937 *Festschrift,* compiled by Paul Schmid, another Tübingen colleague, will be welcomed by all who have learned to rely on the author's many articles on matters of library administration and building, of problems in the field of academic dissertations and exchanges, and most of all in the history of libraries. Those who know Dr. Leyh and his family personally will nod appreciatively when they discover among the books reviewed by him such a title as Arthur Rümann's *Alte deutsche Kinderbücher* (1937).

Icko Iben

University of Illinois

Gutenberg-Jahrbuch 1951. Begründet und herausgegeben von Aloys Ruppel. Mainz, Verlag der Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, [1951]. 211 pp. XVII plates. 10½ x 8¼ inches.

The twenty-sixth *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, which reverts to its normal size, retains its international character and wide scope. Of its thirty-four articles, written in five languages, fifteen come from Germany: eight other countries, from the United States to Egypt, are represented. In addition to the three chief categories, "Die Frühdruckzeit," "Von 1500-1900," "Moderne Druckkunst," there is a group of four articles on the history of paper.

Alban Dold, the Director of the Palimpsest-Institut at Beuron, sets out photographic evidence confirming Dziatzko's theory that the 36-line Bible was set up from B 42: the photographs are reproduced. Victor Scholderer concludes that "in and around the year 1476 another press not hitherto allowed for was working at Nuremberg with material derived from Sensenschmidt and in rivalry with him," and suggests that this press may be that of Heinrich Kefer, who was once Sensenschmidt's partner. Jean Vial, the administrator of the French educational services in Germany and Austria, stresses the international nature of early printing, showing the large part played by Germans in the Paris and Lyons printing of the fifteenth century. A similar account might be given of early printing at other centres. The vicissitudes of Robert Estienne's *Grecs du roi* are described by M. Blanchot, the Director of the Imprimerie Nationale, in which they are now preserved and are still used. By reference to the city archives of Strasbourg, François Ritter sets out the history of the printing houses of the successors of Johann Prüss the Elder. H. Presser formulates the rigid stylistic laws governing fifteenth-century book design, drawing a parallel between the structure of the page and that of the classical building: this contrasts with Paul Renner's plea for asymmetrical, "Functional" typography in modern books. K. Holter dates the foundation of the Austrian monastic collections of printed books to the early 1470's: his analysis of the places of printing of these early books casts valuable light on the structure of the book trade at that time. He attributes the lack of importance of Austria as a printing centre to political conditions and to the commercial preëminence of the South German cities.

Lamberto Donati examines the symbolism of Regnault's devices. Karl Schottenloher discusses a pamphlet written by Wilhelm Misocacus in 1583, astrologically prophesying the fall of the Habsburgs: this he regards as a piece of political propaganda. Josef Benzing discusses the beginnings

of printing at Duisburg, with special reference to the cartographical activities of Mercator. M. Y. Hammam, the Director-General of the Egyptian Government Press, sets out the history of printing in Egypt, with which the Press is closely bound up, and describes the recent introduction of Arabic capital letters.

Oliver Simon, of the Curwen Press, writes on "Mass Production and the Art of the Book in England," stressing the recent transfer of typographical effort from the expensive "limited edition" to the cheap mass-produced book; and Julius Rodenberg gives an enthusiastic account of that Press's achievement. F. C. Avis describes the brief career of the Doves Press.

Dard Hunter describes some American paper labels, which are reproduced. Dr. Alma Langenbach puts the case for watermarks as an object of ethnological research. A. W. Kazmeier describes two fourteenth-century paper documents which cast an interesting light on Milanese commercial relations with Mainz.

Dr. Ruppel's annual report of the Gesellschaft concludes a volume which is, as ever, attractively produced.

DEREK A. CLARKE

British Museum